arXiv:math/0608724v1 [math.CA] 29 Aug 2006

# Approximate and global differentiability of functions over non-archimedean fields.

S.V. Ludkovsky.

23.08.2006

**Abstract**

The article is devoted to the investigation of approximate, global and along curves smoothness of functions $f(x_1,...,x_m)$ of variables $x_1,...,x_m$ in infinite fields with non trivial multiplicative ultra-norms and relations between them. Then classes of smoothness $C^{n,r}$ and $C^{n,r}_b$ and more general in the sense of Lipschitz for partial difference quotients are considered and theorems for them are proved. Moreover, an approximate differentiability of functions relative to measures is defined and investigated. Its relations with lipschitzian property and almost everywhere differentiability are studied. Finally theorems about relations between approximate differentiability by all variables and along curves are proved.

## 1 Introduction

Fields with non-archimedean valuations such as the field of $p$-adic numbers were first introduced by K. Hensel [7]. Then it was proved by A. Ostrowski [16] that on the field of rational numbers each multiplicative norm is either the usual norm as in $\mathbf{R}$ or is equivalent to a non-archimedean norm $|x| = p^{-k}$, where $x = np^k/m \in \mathbf{Q}$, $n, m, k \in \mathbf{Z}$, $p \geq 2$ is a prime number, $n$ and $m$ and $p$ are mutually pairwise prime numbers. It is well known, that each locally compact infinite field with a non trivial non-archimedean valuation is either a finite algebraic extension of the field of $p$-adic numbers or is isomorphic to the field $\mathbf{F}_{p^k}(\theta)$ of power series of the variable $\theta$ with expansion coefficients in the finite field $\mathbf{F}_{p^k}$ of $p^k$ elements, where $p \geq 2$ is a prime number, $k \in \mathbf{N}$ is a natural number [18, 22]. Non locally compact fields are also wide spread [4, 18, 19].

Last years non-archimedean analysis [18, 19, 20] and mathematical physics [8, 9, 10, 21, 17] are being fastly delevoped. But many questions and problems remain open.

In the non-archimedean analysis classes of smoothness are defined in another fashion as in the classical case over $\mathbf{R}$, since locally constant functions on fields $\mathbf{K}$ with non-archimedean valuations are infinite differentiable and there exist non trivial non locally constant functions infinite differentiable with identically zero derivatives [19, 20]. This is caused by the stronger ultrametric inequality $|x + y| \leq \max(|x|, |y|)$ in comparison with the usual triangle inequality, where $|x|$ is a multiplicative norm in $\mathbf{K}$ [18]. In papers [12, 13, 14, 1] there were considered classes of smoothness $C^n$ for functions of several variables in non-archimedean fields or in topological vector spaces over such fields.

In the classical functional analysis the approximate differentiability and almost everywhere differentiability are widely used and studied, for example, for the needs of the geometric measure theory [6]. On the other hand, in the non-archimedean case this subject was not yet investigated.

This paper is devoted to the investigation of smoothness of functions $f(x_1, ..., x_m)$ of variables $x_1, ..., x_m$ in infinite fields with non trivial non-archimedean valuations, where $m \geq 2$. In the paper fields locally compact and as well as non locally compact are considered. Theorems about classes of smoothness $C^n$ or $C^n_b$ of functions with continuous or bounded uniformly continuous on bounded domains partial difference quotients up to the order $n$ are investigated.

In the second section the approximate limits and approximate differentiability in the sense of partial difference quotients are defined and investigated over locally compact fields relative to the Haar nonnegative measures on fields. Non-archimedean analogs of classical theorems of Kirzsbraun, Rademacher, Stepanoff, Whitney are formulated and proved (see Theorems 2.8, 9, 17, 22 respectively). Their relations with the lipschitzian property and almost everywhere differentiability are studied (see Theorems 2.15, 19, 20, 23, 24). Finally theorems 2.25 and 26 about relations between approximate differentiability by all variables and along curves are proved. Frequently formulations of theorems and their proofs in the non-archimedean case are different from the classical case due to specific features of the non-archimedean analysis and underlying fields. All results of this paper are obtained for the first time.

## 2 Approximate differentiability of functions

**1. Definition and Notations.** Let $\mathbf{K}$ be an infinite locally compact field with a non trivial non archimedean valuation and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K}) = \mathcal{B}$ be a Borel $\sigma$-algebra of subsets of $\mathbf{K}$. A $\sigma$-additive $\sigma$-finite measure $\mu : \mathcal{B} \to [0, \infty]$ is called the Haar measure, if $\mu$ is non zero and $\mu(x + A) = \mu(A)$ for each $x \in \mathbf{K}$ and $A \in \mathcal{B}$. For convenience put $\mu(B(\mathbf{K}, 0, 1)) = 1$ and choose an equivalent valuation $|x| = |x|_{\mathbf{K}} = mod_{\mathbf{K}}(x)$ in $\mathbf{K}$, where $mod_{\mathbf{K}}(x)$ is the modular function such that $\mu(xB(\mathbf{K}, 0, R)) = mod_{\mathbf{K}}(x)\mu(B(\mathbf{K}, 0, R))$ for each $x \in \mathbf{K}$, where $R$ belongs to the valuation group $\Gamma_{\mathbf{K}} := \{|x| : 0 \ne x \in \mathbf{K}\}$ of $\mathbf{K}$, $A_1A_2 := \{a : a = a_1a_2, a_1 \in A_1, a_2 \in A_2\}$ for $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathbf{K}$, $B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, R) := \{z \in \mathbf{K}^m : |z - y| \le R\}$, $m \in \mathbf{N}$. For $\mathbf{K}^m$ take the measure $\mu^m = \otimes_{j=1}^m \mu_j$, where $\mu_j = \mu =: \mu^1$ for each $j$, such that $\mu^m(A_1 \times ... \times A_m) = \prod_{j=1}^m \mu(A_j)$ for each $A_1, ..., A_m \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K})$, $\otimes_{j=1}^m \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K})$ is the minimal $\sigma$-algebra generated by subsets of the form $A_1 \times ... \times A_m$ and the Borel $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K}^m)$ of $\mathbf{K}^m$ coincides with $\otimes_{j=1}^m \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K})$.

**2. Remark.** Suppose that $(X, \rho_X)$ is a metric space with a set $X$ and a metric $\rho_X$ in it. A non negative measure $\nu$ on a $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{C}$ of $X$ is called Borel regular if and only if $\mathcal{B}(X) \subset \mathcal{C}$ and for each $A \in \mathcal{C}$ there exists $H \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ such that $\nu(H) = \nu(A)$, where $\mathcal{B}(X)$ denotes the Borel $\sigma$-algebra of $X$ which is the minimal $\sigma$-algebra generated by open subsets of $X$. Denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the class of all Borel regular non negative measures $\nu$ on $X$ such that each bounded subset $A$ in $X$ has a finite measure $0 \le \nu(A) < \infty$.

Consider the family $\mathcal{N}$ of all subsets $A$ of $X$ for which there exists $G = G(A) \in \mathcal{B}(X)$ such that $A \subset G$ and $\nu(G) = 0$. The minimal $\sigma$-algebra $\mathcal{A}_\nu = \mathcal{A}_\nu(X)$ generated by $\mathcal{B}(X) \cup \mathcal{N}$ is the $\nu$-completion of $\mathcal{B}(X)$ and it consists of $\nu$-measurable subsets.

A subset of the form $\{(y, A) : y \in A \subset X\}$ is called a covering relation. If $Y$ is a subset of $X$, then put $V(Y) := \{A :$ there exists $y \in Y, (y, A) \in V\}$, where $V$ is a covering relation in $X$. Then $V$ is called fine at a point $y$ if and only if $\inf_{(y,A)\in V} diam(A) = 0$, where with each $A \subset X$ is associated its diameter $diam(A) := \sup_{x,y\in A} \rho_X(x, y)$.

Consider a covering relation $V$ in $X$ satisfying conditions:

$(V1)$ $V(X)$ is a family of Borel subsets of $X$,

$(V2)$ $V$ is fine at each point of $X$,

$(V3)$ if $C \subset V$ and $Y \subset X$ and $C$ is fine at each point of $Y$, then $C(Y)$ has a countable disjoint subfamily covering $\nu$ almost all of $Y$.

If for a given $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ a covering relation $V$ satisfies Conditions $(V1-V3)$, then it is called a $\nu$ Vitali relation.

Suppose that $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$ and and $V$ is a $\nu$ Vitali relation. With each $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}$ there is associated another measure $\lambda_\nu$ defined by the formula:

$\lambda_\nu(A) := \inf\{\lambda(S) : S \in \mathcal{B}(X), \nu(A \setminus S) = 0\}$, whenever $A \subset X$, hence $\lambda_\nu \le \lambda$.

If a covering relation $V$ is fine at a point $x \in X$ and $f : dom(f) \to [-\infty, \infty]$, where $dom(f) \subset \mathcal{B}(X)$ is the domain of $f$, then

$(V) \lim_{S \to x} f(S) := \lim_{0<\epsilon\to 0} \{f(S) : (x,S) \in V, diam(S) < \epsilon, S \in dom(f)\}$, analogously are defined

$(V) \lim_{S\to x} \sup f(S) := \lim_{0<\epsilon\to 0} \sup\{f(S) : (x,S) \in V, diam(S) < \epsilon, S \in dom(f)\}$
and $(V) \lim_{S\to x} \inf f$.

For a subset $A$ in $X$ and a point $x \in X$ the limit $(V) \lim_{S\to x} \nu(S \cap A)/\nu(S)$ is called the $(\nu, V)$ density of $A$ at $x$.

If $g : X \to Y$ is a mapping of a metric space $(X, \rho_X)$ into a (Hausdorff) topological space $Y$, then $y \in Y$ is called an approximate limit of $g$ at $x$ (relative to a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ and a $\nu$ Vitaly relation $V$) if and only of for each neighborhood $W$ of $y$ in $Y$ the set $X \setminus g^{-1}(W)$ has zero density at $x$ and it is denoted by $y = (\nu, V) ap \lim_{z\to x} g(z)$. If $(\nu, V)$ are specified, then they may be omitted for brevity.

A function $g$ is called $(\nu, V)$ approximately continuous if and only if $x \in dom(g)$ and $(\nu, V) ap \lim_{z\to x} g(z) = g(x)$.

**3. Definitions.** Let $Y$ be a topological vector space over $\mathbf{K}$, $g : U \to Y$ be a mapping, where $U$ is open in $\mathbf{K}^m$, $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Then $g$ is called approximate differentiable at a point $x$ of $U$ if there exists an open neighborhood $W$ of $x$, $W \subset U$, such that $\bar{\Phi}^1 g(x; v; t)$ is $\mu^{2m+1}$ almost everywhere continuous on $W^{(1)}$ and at $x$ there exists a linear mapping $T : \mathbf{K}^m \to Y$ such that $(\mu^m, V) ap \lim_{z\to x} |g(z) - g(x) - T(z-x)|/|z-x| = 0$, where $V = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K}^m)$. This $T$ is also denoted by ${}_{ap}Dg(x)$. If this is satisfied for each $z \in U$, then $g$ is called approximate differentiable on $U$. The family of all such functions denote by ${}_{ap}C^1(U, Y)$. Then also define approximate partial derivatives:

${}_{ap}D_jg(x) := ap\lim_{t\to 0}[g(x_1,...,x_{j-1},x_j+t,x_{j+1},...,x_m)-g(x)]/t$.

The family of all $f \in C^n(U,Y)$ such that $\bar{\Phi}^n f \in {}_{ap}C^1(U^{(n)},Y)$ denote by ${}_{ap}C^{n+1}(U,Y)$. Suppose now that $A$ is a $\mu^m$ measurable subset of $U$ and $Y$ be a normed space, $0 < r \le 1$, then denote by ${}_{ap}C^{n,r}(U,A,Y)$ the family of all $f \in C^n(U,Y)$ with

$ap\overline{\lim}_{x^{(n)}\to z^{(n)}}\|\bar{\Phi}^k f(x^{(n)}) - \bar{\Phi}^n f(z^{(n)})\|_{C^0(V^{(n)}_{z,R},Y)}/|x^{(n)}-z^{(n)}|^r < \infty$

for $\mu^m$ almost all $z \in A$ and each $0 < R < \infty$, where $V^{(k)}_{z,R}$ corresponds to $U_{z,R} = U \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m,z,R)$.

**4. Lemma.** *The families* ${}_{ap}C^{n+1}(U,Y)$ *and* ${}_{ap}C^{n,r}(U,A,Y)$ *are the* $\mathbf{K}$*-linear spaces.*

**Proof.** 1. Since $C^n(U,Y)$ is the $\mathbf{K}$ linear space, then it is sufficient to verify, that the set of all $\bar{\Phi}^n f$ with $f \in {}_{ap}C^{n+1}(U,Y)$ is $\mathbf{K}$ linear. Therefore, the consideration reduces to ${}_{ap}C^1(U,Y)$, where $U^{(n)}$ is denoted also by $U$. If $f,g \in {}_{ap}C^1(U,Y)$ and $a,b \in \mathbf{K}$, then

$\bar{\Phi}^1(af+bg)(x;v;t) = a\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t) + b\bar{\Phi}^1 g(x;v;t)$,

since for $\mu^{2m+1}$-almost all points $(x;v;t) \in \mathbf{K}^{2m+1}$ the right side terms are continuous and hence the left side term is such also. If $x \in U$, then

$ap\lim_{z\to x}|(af+bg)(z)-(af+bg)(x)-a\,{}_{ap}Df(x).(z-x)-b\,{}_{ap}Dg(x).(z-x)|/|z-x| \le ap\lim_{z\to x}|a||f(z)-f(x)-{}_{ap}Df(x).(z-x)|/|z-x| + ap\lim_{z\to x}|b||g(z)-g(x)-{}_{ap}Dg(x).(z-x)|/|z-x| = 0$, hence there exists ${}_{ap}D(af+bg)(x) = a\,{}_{ap}Df(x) + b\,{}_{ap}Dg(x)$.

For each $f \in {}_{ap}C^1(U,Y)$ the operator $T = {}_{ap}Df(x)$ is unique, since the difference $H = T_1 - T_2$ of two such $\mathbf{K}$-linear mappings is subordinated to the condition: $ap\lim_{v\to 0}|Hv|/|v| = ap\lim_{z\to a}|H(z-x)|/|z-x| = 0$ due to Definition 3. Therefore, if $0 < \epsilon < 1$, then there exists $R > 0$, $R \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$, such that $\mu^m(B(\mathbf{K}^m,0,R)\cap\{v \in \mathbf{K}^m : |Hv| > \epsilon|v|\}) < \epsilon^m R^m$. If $w \in B(\mathbf{K}^m,0,R)$ and $v \in B(\mathbf{K}^m,w,\epsilon R)$ with $|Hv| \le \epsilon|v|$, then $|Hw| \le \max(|H(w-v)|,|Hv|) \le \epsilon R\max(\|H\|,1)$, consequently, $\|H\| \le \epsilon\max(1,\|H\|)$, consequently, $\|H\| = 0$, since $\epsilon > 0$ can be chosen arbitrary small. At the same time $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t)$ is unique on $U^{(1)}$ up to a set of $\mu^{2m+1}$-measure zero.

2. The second assertion follows from the inequality

$ap\overline{\lim}_{x^{(n)}\to z^{(n)}}\|\bar{\Phi}^k(af+bg)(x^{(n)})-\bar{\Phi}^n(af+bg)(z^{(n)})\|_{C^0(V^{(n)}_{z,R},Y)}/|x^{(n)}-z^{(n)}|^r \le$
$\max(ap\overline{\lim}_{x^{(n)}\to z^{(n)}}|a|\|\bar{\Phi}^k f(x^{(n)}) - \bar{\Phi}^n f(z^{(n)})\|_{C^0(V^{(n)}_{z,R},Y)}/|x^{(n)}-z^{(n)}|^r;$
$|b|ap\overline{\lim}_{x^{(n)}\to z^{(n)}}\|\bar{\Phi}^k g(x^{(n)}) - \bar{\Phi}^n g(z^{(n)})\|_{C^0(V^{(n)}_{z,R},Y)}/|x^{(n)}-z^{(n)}|^r < \infty$
for each $a,b \in \mathbf{K}$ and $f,g \in {}_{ap}C^{n,r}(U,A,Y)$.

**5. Note.** For a locally compact field $\mathbf{K}$ each $x \in \mathbf{K}$ has the decomposition $x = \sum_n a_n \pi^n$ for $char(\mathbf{K}) = 0$ and $x = \sum_n a_n \theta^n$ for $char(\mathbf{K}) = p > 0$ (see Introduction), where $a_n = a_n(x)$ are expansion coefficients. Introduce on $\mathbf{K}$ the linear ordering: $x \prec y$ if and only if there exists $m \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $a_n(x) = a_n(y)$ for each $n < m$ and $a_m(x) < a_m(y)$ with the natural ordering either in $B(\mathbf{K}, 0, 1)/B(\mathbf{K}, 0, |\pi|)$ or in $\mathbf{F}_{p^k}$ respectively. In the contrary case we write $x = y$. This linear ordering is compatible with neither the additive nor the multiplicative structure of $\mathbf{K}$, but it is useful and it was introduced by M. van der Put [19]. In $\mathbf{K}^m$ we can consider the linear ordering: $x \prec y$ if and only if there exists $l \in \mathbf{N}$ such that ${}_jx = {}_jy$ for each $1 \le j < l$ and ${}_lx \prec {}_ly$, where $x = ({}_1x, ..., {}_mx) \in \mathbf{K}^m$, ${}_ix \in \mathbf{K}$ for each $i = 1, ..., m$.

**6. Theorem.** *Let $\nu$ be a measure on $\mathbf{K}^m$, $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{K}^m)$, let also $f : \mathbf{K}^m \to \mathbf{K}$ be $\nu$-measurable and $y_1, y_2, y_3, ... \in \mathbf{K}$ are pairwise distinct and such that for each $y \in \mathbf{K}$ and every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist $n, k \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $|y_n - y| < \epsilon$ and $y_n \preceq y$ and $|y_k - y| < \epsilon$ and $y \preceq y_k$. Then there exist $\nu$-measurable subsets $A_1, A_2, A_3, ...$ in $\mathbf{K}^m$ with characteristic functions $g_j = ch_{A_j}$ such that*

$f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} y_n g_n(x)$

*for each $x \in \mathbf{K}^m$.*

**Proof.** If $|y_l - y_j| \le \delta$, where $0 < \delta$, then $\max(|y - y_l|, |y - y_j|) \le \delta$ for each $y_l \preceq y \preceq y_j$. In the space $L^\infty(\mathbf{K}^m, \nu, \mathbf{K})$ the $\mathbf{K}$-linear span of characteristic functions of clopen subsets is dense. Consider the set $W_n := \{x \in \mathbf{K} : |f(x)| \le n\}$, where $n \in \mathbf{N}$, then $f|_{W_n} \in L^\infty(\mathbf{K}^m, \nu, \mathbf{K})$. Therefore, $f(x)|_{W_n \setminus W_{n-1}} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} s_{n,k} g_{n,k}(x)$, where each $g_{n,k}$ is the characteristic function of a $\nu$-measurable subset in $\mathbf{K}^m$, $s_{n,k} \in \mathbf{K}$, $W_0 := \emptyset$. Then $f(x) = \sum_{k,n=1}^{\infty} s_{n,k} g_{n,k}(x)$ converges pointwise for each $x \in \mathbf{K}^m$.

Therefore, it is enough to construct the decomposition of $f|_{W_q \setminus W_{q-1}}$ for arbitrary $q$. Thus consider the subset $y_n$ with $|y_n| \le q$. For each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a finite $\epsilon$-net $\{y_{l(s)} : s = 1, ..., b\}$, $b = b(\epsilon)$, that is for each $y \in \mathbf{K}$ there exists $s$, $1 \le s \le b$, such that $|y - y_{l(s)}| < \epsilon$.

Take the sequence $\epsilon_j = |\pi|^j$ and $b_j = b(\epsilon_j)$. If $y_n$ is the last point of the $|\pi|^j$ net, then new $|\pi|^{j+1}$-net begins and put $u = 1$, if it is not so, then take $u = 0$. Suppose that $\|f - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j g_j\|_{L^\infty(A_n, \nu, \mathbf{K})} > 0$. Otherwise the decomposition is already found. Put by induction $A_n = A_{n,n+l} := \{x : y_n \preceq f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j g_j(x) \prec y_{n+l}\}$ if $y_n \preceq y_{n-k}$, where $l \ge 1$ is the minimal natural number for which $y_n \prec y_{n+l}$ and $|\pi|^{u+1} \|f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j g_j(x)\|_{L^\infty(A_n, \nu, \mathbf{K})} < |y_n - y_{n+l}| \le |\pi|^u \|f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j g_j(x)\|_{L^\infty(A_n, \nu, \mathbf{K})}$; $A_n = A_{n,n+l} := \{x : y_{n+l} \preceq$

$f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j g_j(x) \prec y_n\}$ if $y_{n-k} \preceq y_n$, where $l \geq 1$ is the minimal natural number for which $y_{n+l} \prec y_n$ and $|\pi|^{u+1} \| f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j g_j(x) \|_{L^\infty(A_n, \nu, \mathbf{K})} < |y_n - y_{n+l}| \leq |\pi|^u \| f(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j g_j(x) \|_{L^\infty(A_n, \nu, \mathbf{K})}$, where $k = k(n)$ is a gap on the preceding step as $l$ on this step. In accordance with this algorithm some $A_q$ may be empty, when $n < q < n + l$ for subsequent numbers of the algorithm, so that $g_q = 0$ for such $q$. Then consider the sum $(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j g_j(x)) + y_n g_n$. Since $|y_n - y_{n+l}| \leq |\pi|^u |y_n - y_{n-k}|$ for each $n$ and each $|\pi|^j$-net is finite, then the series $\sum_{j=1}^\infty y_j g_j$ converges. In view of the inequalities above it converges to $f|_{W_q \setminus W_{q-1}}$ by the norm of $L^\infty(\mathbf{K}^m, \nu, \mathbf{K})$ for each $q$. Denote $A_j$ for $f|_{W_q \setminus W_{q-1}}$ by ${}_qA_j$. Then $\bigcup_{q=1}^\infty {}_qA_j =: A_j$ is $\nu$-measurable for each $j$. Since for each $x \in \mathbf{K}^m$ there exists $q$ such that $x \in W_q \setminus W_{q-1}$, then $\sum_{j=1}^\infty y_j g_j(x) = f(x)$ converges pointwise.

**7. Lemma.** *Suppose that* $H$ *is a compact non void subset in* $\mathbf{K}^n \times (\mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\})$ *and* $X_t := \{y \in \mathbf{K}^n : |y - z| \leq |x|^r t$ *for every* $(z, x) \in H\}$ *for* $0 \leq t < \infty$*, where* $0 < r \leq 1$ *is a constant, then* $c := \inf\{t : X_t \neq \emptyset\} < \infty$ *and* $X_c = (\bigcap_{t > c} X_t) \neq \emptyset$*. If* $q \in X_c$*, then* $A_q \neq \emptyset$*, where* $A_q := \{z :$ *there exists* $(z, x) \in H$ *with* $|q - z| = |x|^r c\}$*.*

**Proof.** Each set $X_t$ is compact, since $H$ is compact. Consider the projection $\pi_{n+1} : \mathbf{K}^{n+1} \to \mathbf{K}$ such that $\pi_{n+1}({}_1x, ..., {}_{n+1}x) = {}_{n+1}x$, where ${}_jx \in \mathbf{K}$ for each $j = 1, ..., n+1$. Thus $\pi_{n+1}(H)$ is compact as the continuous image of the compact set. But $\pi_{n+1}(H)$ is contained in $\mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\}$, consequently, $\inf_{(z,x) \in H} |x| > 0$. At the same time $\sup_{(z,x) \in H} |z| < \infty$, hence $0 \leq \sup\{|z|/|x|^r : (z, x) \in H\} < \infty$. Therefore, $0 \in X_t$ for each $t \geq \sup\{|z|/|x|^r : (z, x) \in H\}$. Then $X_c = \bigcap_{c < t < \infty} X_t \neq \emptyset$, since $X_t \subset X_q$ for each $0 < t \leq q$ and $X_t \neq \emptyset$ for each $t > c$. Put $R := \sup\{|x|^r : (z, x) \in H$ for some $z\}$. Consider $y, z \in X_c$, $\alpha \in \mathbf{K}$ with $|\alpha| \leq 1$, then $(a, q) \in H$ implies $|\alpha y + (1 - \alpha) z - a| \leq \max(|\alpha||y - a|, |1 - \alpha||z - a|)$, but $\max(|\alpha|, |1 - \alpha|) \leq 1$, hence $|\alpha y + (1 - \alpha) z - a| \leq |q|^r c$ and $\alpha y + (1 - \alpha) z \in X_c$. Subjecting $\mathbf{K}^n$ to a translation we can suppose without loss of generality that $0 \in X_c$. If $z \in \mathbf{K}^n$ and $|z| = 1$, then $|\pi^s z| > 0$ for each $s \in \mathbf{Z}$. We have $\pi^s z \in X_c$ if and only if $|\pi^s z - a| \leq |x|^r c$ for each $(a, x) \in H$, but $|a| \leq |x|^r c$, since $0 \in X_c$. Thus $\pi^s z \in X_c$ if and only if $|\pi^s z| \leq |x|^r c$ for each $(z, x) \in H$, which is equivalent to $|\pi^s| \leq |x|^r c$ for each $(a, x) \in H$ and in its turn this is equivalent to $|\pi^s| \leq c(\inf_{(z,x) \in H} |x|)^r$. Then there exists $s_0 \in \mathbf{Z}$ such that $|\pi^s| \leq c(\inf_{(z,x) \in H} |x|)^r$ for each $s \geq s_0$, $s \in \mathbf{Z}$. We have $H \cap \{(z, x) : |z| = |x|^r c\} \neq \emptyset$, hence $A_q \neq \emptyset$, where $q = 0$ after translation.

**8. Theorem.** *If $S$ is a subset in $\mathbf{K}^m$ and $f : S \to \mathbf{K}^n$ is a lipschitzian function with constants $0 < Lip_1(f) := C < \infty$ and $0 < Lip_2(f) := r \le 1$:*

(1) $|f(x) - f(y) \le C|x-y|^r$ *for each* $x, y \in S$,
*then $f$ has a lipschitzian extension $g : \mathbf{K}^m \to \mathbf{K}$ such that $Lip_1(f) = Lip_1(g)$ and $Lip_2(f) = Lip_2(g)$, where $n, m \in \mathbf{N}$.*

**Proof.** With the help of transformation $f \mapsto cf$, where $0 \ne c \in \mathbf{K}$ we can suppose that $0 < Lip_1(f) =: b \le 1$. Consider a class $\Psi$ of all lipschitzian extensions $f_j$ of $f$ on some subset $T_j$ of $\mathbf{K}^m$ having the same constants $C, r$. Then $\Psi$ is partially ordered $(f_1, T_1) \preceq (f_2, T_2)$ if $T_1 \subset T_2$ and $f_1|_{T_1} = f_2|_{T_1}$. Each linearly ordered subset $\Phi$ in $\Psi$ has a maximal element $(h, T)$: $h|_{T_j} = f_j$, $(f_j, T_j) \preceq (h, T)$ for each $(f_j, T_j) \in \Phi$, where $T \supset \bigcup_j T_j$, since for each $T_j, T_k$ there is the inequality $j \prec k$ if and only if $T_j \subset T_k$ and $f_j|_{T_j} = f_k|_{T_j}$. In view of the Kuratowski-Zorn lemma [5] there exists a maximal element $(g, T)$ in $\Psi$, $g : T \to \mathbf{K}^n$, where $T \subset \mathbf{K}^m$. It is sufficient to show, that if there exists $z \in \mathbf{K}^m \setminus T$, then there exists $y \in \mathbf{K}^n$ such that $|y - g(x)| \le b|z-x|^r$ for every $x \in T$, consequently, $g \cup \{(z, y)\} \in \Psi$ and $(g, T)$ would not be maximal in $\Psi$. Thus we must prove, that $\bigcap_{x \in T} B(\mathbf{K}^n, g(x), b|x-z|^r) \ne \emptyset$. These balls are compact, hence it is sufficient to prove that $\bigcap_{x \in F} B(\mathbf{K}^n, g(x), b|x-z|^r) \ne \emptyset$ for each finite subset $F$ in $T$. Take $X_c$ from Lemma 7 and $q \in X_c$, then $|q - g(x_i)| = |x_i - x|^r c$ for $i = 1, ..., k$, $g(x_i) \in A_q$, where $1 \le k \in \mathbf{Z}$, $(q, x) \in H$. We will show that $q \in X_b$. If $0 < c \le b$, then $q \in X_c \subset X_b$. If $c > b$, then $|q - g(x_i)| > |x_i - x|^r b$ for each $x_i$, that is impossible by the supposition of this theorem.

If $x$ is a limit point in $T$, then take a sequence $\{x_n : n\}$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} x_n = x$ and $q = \lim_{n\to\infty} g(x_n)$, since $g$ is continuous on $T$ and $\{g(x_n) : n\}$ is the Cauchy net in $\mathbf{K}$, but the latter uniform space is complete, because $\mathbf{K}$ is a locally compact field. Then $|q - g(y)| = \lim_{n\to\infty} |g(x_n) - g(y)| \le b \lim_{n\to\infty} |x_n - y|^r = b|x-y|^r$ for each $y \in T$. Thus $T$ is the closed subset in $\mathbf{K}^m$, hence $\mathbf{K}^m \setminus T$ is open. Suppose that $v \in \mathbf{K}^m \setminus T$, then there exists $\delta := \inf_{x \in T} |v - x| > 0$. Take $\delta \le R < \infty$, then $T \cap B(\mathbf{K}, x_0, R)$ is compact, where $x_0 \in T$ is a marked point. Therefore, there exists $v_0 \in T$ such that $|v - v_0| = \delta$.

We have that $g(T)$ is locally compact and closed in $\mathbf{K}^m$ and $|g(x) - g(y)| \le b|x-y|^r$ for each $x, y \in T$, consequently, $B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(x), b|x-y|^r) = B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(y), b|x-y|^r)$ for each $x, y \in T$. If $|y - v| > |x - v|$, then $|x - y| = |y - v|$, consequently, $B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(y), b|y-v|^r) = B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(y), b|x-y|^r) = B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(x), b|x-y|^r) \supset B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(x), b|x-v|^r)$, hence

$\bigcap_{x\in T} B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(x), b|x-v|^r) \supset \bigcap_{x\in T, |x-v|=|v_0-v|} B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(x), b|x-v|^r)$. On the other hand, $|g(v_0)-g(x)| \le b|v_0-x|^r \le b\max(|x-v|^r, |v_0-v|^r) = b|v_0-v|^r$ for $|x-v| = |v_0-v|$. Therefore, $B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(x), b|x-v|^r) = B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(v_0), b|v_0-v|^r)$ and inevitably $\bigcap_{x\in T} B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(x), b|x-v|^r) \supset B(\mathbf{K}^m, g(v_0), b|v-v_0|^r) \ne \emptyset$, since the valuation of $\mathbf{K}$ is non trivial and $\lim_{k\to\infty} |\pi|^k = 0$.

**9. Theorem.** *Let $U$ be an open subset in $\mathbf{K}$ and let also $g: U \to \mathbf{K}$ be a locally lipschitzian function such that for each $x_0 \in U$ there exist constants $0 < C < \infty$ and $\delta > 0$ and $0 < r \le 1$ with*

(1) $|g(x)-g(y)| \le C|x-y|^r$ *for each* $\max(|x-x_0|, |y-x_0|) < \delta$*,* $x, y \in U$. *Then $\bar{\Phi}^1 g(x;v;t)$ is continuous for $\mu^3$-almost all points in $U^{(1)}$ and $dg(x)/dx = \bar{\Phi}^1 g(x;1;0)$ exists and is continuous for $\mu$-almost all points of $U$.*

**Proof.** The function $g$ is locally lipschitzian, hence it is continuous. On the other hand, the Haar measure $\mu^m$ on $\mathbf{K}^m$ is Radon, that is by the definition it satisfies the following three conditions:

(2) if $J$ is a compact subset of $\mathbf{K}$, then $\mu^m(J) < \infty$;

(3) if $V$ is open in $\mathbf{K}$, then $\mu^m(V) = \sup\{\mu^m(J) : J \text{ is compact }, J \subset V\}$;

(4) if $A$ is a $\mu^m$-measurable subset, $A \subset \mathbf{K}$, then $\mu^m(A) := \inf\{\mu^m(V) : V \text{ is open }, A \subset V\}$.

In view of approximation Theorem 2.2.5 [6] for each $\mu^m$-measurable subset $A$ in $\mathbf{K}^m$ with $\mu^m(A) < \infty$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a compact subset $J \subset A$ such that $\mu^m(A \setminus J) < \epsilon$. If $\mathcal{E}$ is a subset in $U^{(1)}$ of discontinuity of $\bar{\Phi}^1 g$ and $\mathcal{D}$ is a subset of discontinuity of $dg(x)/dx$ in $U$, then it is sufficient to demonstrate, that $\mu^3(\mathcal{E} \cap U^{(1)}_{R,\epsilon}) = 0$ and $\mu(\mathcal{D} \cap U_{R,\epsilon}) = 0$ for each $0 < R < \infty$ and $\epsilon > 0$, where $U_{R,\epsilon}$ is a subset in $U \cap B(\mathbf{K}, 0, R)$ such that $\mu(U \setminus U_{R,\epsilon}) < \epsilon$, since $\mu^3((U^{(1)} \setminus U^{(1)}_{R,\epsilon}) \cap B(\mathbf{K}^3, 0, R)) < 3R^2\epsilon + 3R\epsilon^2 + \epsilon^3$. For each compact set $U_{R,\epsilon}$ the covering $B(\mathbf{K}, x_0, \delta)$ with $\delta = \delta(x_0) > 0$ has a finite subcovering, hence there exist $C = \sup_{x_0 \in U_{R,\epsilon}} C(x_0) < \infty$ and $0 < r = \inf_{x_0 \in U_{R,\epsilon}} r(x_0) \le 1$ for which Inequality (1) is satisfied for each $x, y \in U_{R,\epsilon}$. Consider a restriction $g|_{U_{R,\epsilon}}$, then by Theorem 8 it has a lipschitzian extension $g_{R,\epsilon}$ on $\mathbf{K}$ with the same constants $0 < C < \infty$ and $0 < r \le 1$. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove this theorem for a clopen compact subset $U$ in $\mathbf{K}$ which is supposed in the proof below.

Since the mapping $x \mapsto x + vt$ is continuous by $(x, v, t) \in \mathbf{K}^3$ and $\mu^3$ is the Haar measure on $\mathbf{K}^3$ such that $\mu^3$ has not any atoms, then $\bar{\Phi}^1 g(x;v;t) = [g(x+vt) - g(x)]/t$ is continuous for $\mu^3$-almost all points in $U^{(1)}$ if and only if $[g(x)-g(y)]/[x-y]$ is continuous for $\mu^2$-almost all points of $\mathbf{K}^2$.

Consider the following relation

$V := \{(x,S) : S$ is a compact clopen subset in $\mathbf{K}^m, x \in S\}$, where $m \in \mathbf{N}$. Verify that $V$ is the $\mu^m$ Vitaly relation. Indeed,

(1) $V$ is a covering relation, that is a subset of $\{(x,S) : x \in S \subset \mathbf{K}^m\}$;

(2) $V \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K}^m)$;

(3) for each $0 < R < \infty$ and each $y \in \mathbf{K}^m$ the ball $B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, R)$ belongs to $V$, hence $\inf\{diam(S) : (x,S) \in V\} = 0$ for each $x \in \mathbf{K}^m$, consequently, $V$ is fine at each point of $\mathbf{K}^m$;

(4) $\mathbf{K}^m$ is locally compact separable and with a countable base of its topology consisting of clopen balls. Thus if $W \subset V$ and $Z \subset \mathbf{K}^m$ and $W$ is fine at each point $z \in Z$, then $W(Z)$ has a countable disjoint subfamily covering almost all of $Z$. Indeed, $W(Z)$ gives a base of topology inherited from $\mathbf{K}^m$. This base is countable, hence $Z \subset \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} U_j$, where each $U_j$ is a clopen compact in $\mathbf{K}^m$. Recall that a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(X)$ is called regular, if for each $A \subset X$ there exists a $\nu$-measurable subset $G$ in $X$ such that $A \subset G$ and $\nu(A) = \nu(G)$. With arbitrary measure $\nu$ one associates a regular measure by the formula $\lambda(A) := \inf\{\nu(G) : A \subset G$ and $G$ is $\nu$- measurable$\}$ (see Section 2.1.5 and the Lusin's Theorem 2.3.5 [6]). Put $V_1 = U_1$ and $V_j = U_j \setminus \bigcup_{i<j} U_i$, then $V_i \cap V_j = \emptyset$ for each $i \ne j$. Since $\mu^m$ is regular, then for each $V_j$ there exists a finite subfamily $W_{k,j} \in W$ such that $\mu^m(V_j \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{n} W_{k,j}) < \epsilon_j$, where $n = n(\epsilon_j, j) \in \mathbf{N}$, $W_{k,j} \subset V_j$, $W_{k,j} \cap W_{l,j} = \emptyset$ for each $k \ne l$. Choose $\epsilon_j = \epsilon|\pi|^j$ and let $\epsilon > 0$ tend to zero. Thus $\bigcup_{k,j} W_{k,j}$ covers almost all of $Z$, since $0 \le \mu^1(Z \setminus \bigcup_{j,k} W_{k,j}) \le \lim_{0<\epsilon\to 0} \sum_j \mu^m(V_j \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{n(\epsilon_j,j)} W_{k,j}) = 0$.

Since the field $\mathbf{K}$ is locally compact, then there exists a generator $|\pi|$ of the valuation group $\Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$ such that $|x| = |\pi|^{-\nu(x)}$ for each $x \in \mathbf{K}$, where $|x| = mod_{\mathbf{K}}(x)$ is the multiplicative norm in $\mathbf{K}$, while $\nu(x) = \nu_{\mathbf{K}}(x) \in \mathbf{Z}$ is called the valuation function or valuation [18, 19, 22]. For the first statement of the theorem it is sufficient to prove, that the $\mu^2$ measure of the set

$\mathcal{A} := \{(x,y) \in U^2 : \lim_{(x_1,y_1)\to(x,y)}[g(x_1)-g(y_1)]/[x_1-y_1]$
either does not exist or is not equal to $[g(x)-g(y)]/[x-y]\}$
is zero, since $\mu^2\{(x,x) : x \in \mathbf{K}\} = 0$. Since $g$ is the lipschitzian function and

$[g(x_1)-g(y_1)]/[x_1-y_1] - [g(x)-g(y)]/[x-y] = [(g(x_1)-g(y_1))((x-y)-(x_1-y_1)) + ((g(x_1)-g(y_1))-(g(x)-g(y)))(x_1-y_1)]/[(x_1-y_1)(x-y)]$, then

(5) $|[g(x_1)-g(y_1)]/[x_1-y_1] - [g(x)-g(y)]/[x-y]| \le C\max(|x_1 -$

$y_1|^r \max(|x_1-x|, |y_1-y|), |x_1-y_1| \max(|x_1-x|^r, |y_1-y|^r))/[|x_1-y_1||x-y|]$. Under suitable affine mapping $q(x) := a(x-x_0)$ the image of $U$ is contained in $B(\mathbf{K}, 0, |\pi|)$, where $0 \ne a \in \mathbf{K}$, $x_0 \in \mathbf{K}$, so without restriction of generality suppose that $U \subset B(\mathbf{K}, 0, |\pi|)$, since $\bar{\Phi}^1 g$ is almost everywhere continuous on $U^{(1)}$ if and only if $\bar{\Phi}^1 g \circ q^{-1}$ is such on $(q(U))^{(1)}$. Consider the sets

(6) $A_{l,n,k} := \{(x,y) \in U^2 : |x-y| = |\pi|^l,$ there exists $(x_1, y_1) \in U^2$ such that $\max(|x_1-x|, |y_1-y|) \le |\pi|^k, |[g(x_1)-g(y_1)]/(x_1-y_1) - [g(x)-g(y)]/(x-y)| \ge |\pi|^n\}$,
where $l, n, k \in \mathbf{N}$. We have $\mu^2((x,y) \in \mathbf{K}^2 : |x-y| = |\pi|^l, y \in B(\mathbf{K}, y_0, |\pi|^s)) = (|\pi|^l - |\pi|^{l+1})|\pi|^s$ for each $l, s \in \mathbf{N}$. If $|x-y| = |x_1-y_1| > \max(|x_1-x|, |y_1-y|)$, then from (5) it follows, that $|[g(x_1)-g(y_1)]/[x_1-y_1] - [g(x)-g(y)]/[x-y]| \le C \max(|x-y|^{(r-2)} \max(|x_1-x|, |y_1-y|), |x-y|^{-1} \max(|x_1-x|^r, |y_1-y|^r))$. Choose $k \in \mathbf{N}$ sufficiently large, $k \ge m_0$, such that $C \max[|\pi|^{k+(r-2)l}, |\pi|^{rk-l}] < |\pi|^n$, then $\mu^2(A_{l,n,k}) = 0$, since $\mu^2(A_{l,n,k} \cap \{y \in B(\mathbf{K}, y_0, |\pi|^l)\}) = 0$ for each $y_0 \in \mathbf{K}$, where $m_0 = m_0(l) \in \mathbf{N}$. Let $l_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ be a large number, take $m_0 = m_0(l_0)$ such that $l_0$ tends to the infinity if and only if $m_0$ tends to the infinity, then $\mu^2(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{k, k \ge m_0} \bigcup_{l=1}^\infty A_{l,n,k}) \le \sum_{l=l_0}^\infty (|\pi|^{l+1} - |\pi|^{l+2}) = |\pi|^{l_0+1}$, since $B(\mathbf{K}, 0, |\pi|) \setminus \{0\} = \bigcup_{l=1}^\infty \{x \in \mathbf{K} : |x| = |\pi|^l\}$ and $\mu(\{0\}) = 0$, consequently, $\mu^2(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \bigcap_{m=1}^\infty \bigcup_{k, k \ge m} \bigcup_{l=1}^\infty A_{l,n,k}) \le |\pi|^{l_0+1}$, where $l_0$ is arbitrary large. Therefore, $\mu^2(\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \bigcap_{m=1}^\infty \bigcup_{k, k \ge m} \bigcup_{l=1}^\infty A_{l,n,k}) = 0$, consequently, $\mu^2(\mathcal{A}) = 0$, since due to (6)

$\mathcal{A} \subset \{(x,y) \in U^2 :$ there exists a sequence $(x^m, y^m) \in U^2$ such that $\lim_{m \to \infty}(x^m, y^m) = (x,y), \overline{\lim}_{m \to \infty} |[g(x^m)-g(y^m)]/[x^m-y^m] - [g(x)-g(y)]/[x-y]| \ge |\pi|^n$ for some $n \in \mathbf{N}\} \subset (\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \bigcap_{m=1}^\infty \bigcup_{k, k \ge m} \bigcup_{l=1}^\infty A_{l,n,k})$.
Thus $[g(x)-g(y)]/(x-y)$ is $\mu^2$-almost everywhere continuous on $U^2$.

Now prove the second statement, for this mention that the set $\mathcal{A}$ is symmetric relative to the transposition $(x,y) \mapsto (y,x)$. We have that $[g(x) - g(y)]/(x-y)$ is continuous for $\mu^2$-almost all $(x,y) \in U^2$, hence on everywhere dense subset in $U^2$. It is sufficient to show that the $\mu$ measure of the set $\mathcal{C} := \{x \in U : \lim_{(x_1,y_1) \to (x,x)} [g(x_1) - g(y_1)]/[x_1 - y_1]$
either does not exist or is not equal to $\lim_{y \to x} [g(x) - g(y)]/[x-y]$
or the latter limit does not exist $\}$
is zero. For this consider the sets

(7) $E_{l,n,k} := \{x \in U :$ there exist $y \in U$ and $(x_1, y_1) \in U^2$ such that $|x-y| = |\pi|^l, \max(|x_1-x|, |y_1-y|) \le |\pi|^k, |[g(x_1)-g(y_1)]/(x_1-y_1) - [g(x)-g(y)]/(x-y)| \ge |\pi|^n\}$,
where $l, n, k \in \mathbf{N}$. There exists $m_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that for each $k \ge m_0$ there is

satisfied the inequality $C\max[|\pi|^{k+(r-2)l}, |\pi|^{rk-l}] < |\pi|^n$, hence $\mu(E_{l,n,k}) = 0$ for such $k$, since $\mu^1(E_{l,n,k} \cap \{y \in B(\mathbf{K}, y_0, |\pi|^l)\}) = 0$ for each $y_0 \in \mathbf{K}$. For $l_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ take $m_0 = m_0(l_0)$ such that $l_0$ tends to the infinity if and only if $m_0$ tends to the infinity, then

$\mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k,k\ge m} \bigcup_{l,l\ge l_0} E_{l,n,k}) \le \sum_{l=l_0}^{\infty}(|\pi|^l - |\pi|^{l+1}) = |\pi|^{l_0}$, consequently, $\mu^1(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k,k\ge m} \bigcap_{s=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{l,l\ge s} E_{l,n,k}) \le |\pi|^{l_0}$, where $l_0$ is arbitrary large. Therefore, $\mu(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k,k\ge m} \bigcap_{s=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{l,l\ge s} E_{l,n,k}) = 0$, consequently, $\mu(\mathcal{C}) = 0$, since in view of (7)

$\mathcal{C} \subset \{x \in U :$ there exists a sequence $(z^m, x^m, y^m) \in U^3$ such that $\lim_{m\to\infty}(z^m, x^m, y^m) = (x, x, y), \overline{\lim}_{m\to\infty}|[g(x^m) - g(y^m)]/[x^m - y^m] - [g(x) - g(z^m)]/[x - z^m]| \ge |\pi|^n$ for some $n \in \mathbf{N}\} \subset (\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k,k\ge m} \bigcap_{s=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{l,l\ge s} E_{l,n,k})$. Therefore, $dg(x)/dx$ exists and is $\mu$-almost everywhere continuous on $U$.

**10. Lemma.** *If* $S$ *is a* $\mu^m \otimes \mu^k$ *measurable subset of* $\mathbf{K}^m \times \mathbf{K}^k$, $\epsilon > 0$ *and* $\delta > 0$ *and* $T := \{x \in \mathbf{K}^m : \mu^k(\{z : (x, z) \in S, |z| \le R\}) \le \epsilon R^k\}$, *whenever* $0 < R < \delta$, *then* $T$ *is* $\mu^m$ *measurable.*

**Proof.** For each $0 < R < \infty$ the set $S_R := S \cap \{(x, z) : |z| \le R\}$ is $\mu^m \otimes \mu^k$ measurable and by the Fubini theorem $\mu^k(\{z : (x, z) \in S_R\})$ is the $\mu^m$ measurable function of the variable $x$, hence $T$ is $\mu^m$ measurable, since $T = \{x \in \mathbf{K}^m : \mu^k(\{z : (x, z) \in S_R\}) \le \epsilon R^k\}$.

**11. Lemma.** *If a function* $\phi : \mathbf{K}^m \times \mathbf{K}^k \to \mathbf{R}$ *is* $\mu^m \otimes \mu^k$ *measurable, then* $ap\overline{\lim}_{z\to 0}\phi(x, z)$ *and* $ap\underline{\lim}_{z\to 0}\phi(x, z)$ *are* $\mu^m$ *measurable functions of the variable* $x$.

**Proof.** For each $c \in \mathbf{R}$ applying Lemma 10 to the sets $\{(x, z) : \phi(x, z) > c\}$ and $\{(x, z) : \phi(x, z) < c\}$ we get the statement of this lemma.

**12. Lemma.** *If* $u : \mathbf{K}^n \to \mathbf{K}^m$ *is a* $\mathbf{K}$*-linear epimorphism and* $A$ *is a* $\mu^m$ *measurable set, then* $u^{-1}(A)$ *is* $\mu^n$ *measurable.*

**Proof.** This follows from the fact that there exists a $\mathbf{K}$-linear isomorphism $v : \mathbf{K}^n \to \mathbf{K}^m \times \mathbf{K}^{n-m}$ such that $v \circ u^{-1}(A) = A \times \mathbf{K}^{n-m}$.

**13. Lemma.** *If a function* $g : \mathbf{K}^m \to \mathbf{K}$ *is* $\mu^m$ *measurable and* $1 \le k \le m$, *then the* $\mu^k$ *approximate limit is* $ap\lim_{z\to 0} g({}_1x + {}_1z, ..., {}_kx + {}_kz, {}_{k+1}x, ..., {}_mx) = g(x)$ *for* $\mu^m$ *almost all* $x$.

**Proof.** There exists the isomorphism $v : \mathbf{K}^m \to \mathbf{K}^k \times \mathbf{K}^{m-k}$. Put $h(x, y, z) = (x + z, y)$, where $h : \mathbf{K}^k \times \mathbf{K}^{m-k} \times \mathbf{K}^k \to \mathbf{K}^k \times \mathbf{K}^{m-k}$. In view of Lemma 12 the composite function $g \circ h$ is $\mu^k \times \mu^{m-k} \times \mu^k$ measurable. From Lemma 11 it follows, that $A := \{(x, y) : ap\lim_{z\to 0} g(x + z, y) = g(x, y)\}$ is $\mu^k \otimes \mu^{m-k}$ measurable.

Theorem 2.9.13 [6] states that if a function $f$ maps $\nu$ almost all of $X$

into $Y$, where $(X,\rho_X)$ is a metric space, $(Y,\rho_Y)$ is a separable metric space, then $f$ is $\nu$ measurable if and only if $f$ is approximately $(\nu,V)$ continuous at almost all points of $X$.

In accordance with the latter theorem and the Fubini theorem the function $g(x,y)$ is $\mu^k$ measurable by $x$ for $\mu^{m-k}$ almost all $y$ and $\mu^k(\{x:(x,y)\notin A\})=0$ and the complement of $A$ has $\mu^k$ measure zero.

**14. Corollary.** *If $A$ is $\mu^m$ measurable set in $\mathbf{K}^m$ and $1\le k\le m$, then for $\mu^m$ almost all $y\in A$ the set $\mathbf{K}^k\cap\{x:({}_1x,...,{}_kx,{}_{k+1}y,...,{}_my)\notin A\}$ has zero $\mu^k$ density at $({}_1y,...,{}_ky)$.*

**Proof.** This follows from Lemma 13 for the characteristic function $g=ch_A$, where $ch_A(y)=1$ for each $y\in A$, $ch_A(y)=0$ for each $y\in\mathbf{K}^m\setminus A$.

**15. Theorem.** *If $f:\mathbf{K}^m\to\mathbf{K}^n$ is $\mu^m$ measurable, then $A_i:=dom\ {}_{ap}D_if$ is a $\mu^m$ measurable set, $V_i:=dom\ {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;e_i;t)$ is a $\mu^{m+1}$ measurable set such that $\mu^{m+1}(\mathbf{K}^{m+1}\setminus V_i)=0$, moreover, ${}_{ap}D_if$ and ${}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;e_i;t)$ are $\mu^m|_{A_i}$ and $\mu^{m+1}|_{V_i}$ measurable functions respectively,*

(1) ${}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;v;t)=v_1\ {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x+e_2v_2+...+e_mv_m;e_1;v_1t)+v_2\ {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x+e_3v_2+...+e_mv_m;e_2;v_2t)+...+v_m\ {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;e_m;v_mt)$

*for $\mu^{m+1}$ almost all points $(x,t)$ in $V:=\bigcap_{i=1}^mV_i$ and each $v=v_1e_1+...+v_me_m\in\mathbf{K}^m$,*

(2) ${}_{ap}Df(x).v=\sum_{i=1}^mv_i\ {}_{ap}D_if(x))$

*for $\mu^m$ almost all points $x$ in $A:=\bigcap_{i=1}^mA_i$ and each $v\in\mathbf{K}^m$.*

**Proof.** Since $f=(f_1,...,f_n)$, where $f_j:\mathbf{K}^m\to\mathbf{K}$, then $dom\ {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;e_i;t)=\bigcap_{j=1}^n dom\ {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f_j(x;e_i;t)$ and $dom\ {}_{ap}D_if=\bigcap_{j=1}^n dom\ {}_{ap}D_if_j$ for each $i=1,...,m$, consequently, it is sufficient to prove this theorem for $n=1$. Thus suppose that $n=1$.

In accordance with Theorem 2.9.13 [6] (see its formulation in section 13) the function $\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;v;t)$ is approximately continuous on $\mathbf{K}^m\times\mathbf{K}^m\times(\mathbf{K}\setminus\{0\})$, since $[f(x+vt)-f(x)]/t$ is $\mu^{2m+1}$ measurable on $\mathbf{K}^m\times\mathbf{K}^m\times(\mathbf{K}\setminus\{0\})$ and inevitably $\mu^{m+1}(\mathbf{K}^{m+1}\setminus V_i)=0$, since $\mu(\{0\})=0$. Therefore, Formula (1) is satisfied for $\mu^{m+1}$ almost all points $(x;t)$ in $V$, where $\mu^{m+1}(\mathbf{K}^{m+1}\setminus V)=0$. So it remains to spread this for $t=0$, but ${}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;v;0)=ap\lim_{t\to0}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;v;t)={}_{ap}Df(x).v$ and the proof of this theorem reduces to the proof of its statement relative to ${}_{ap}Df(x)$.

The set $A_i$ is $\mu^m$ measurable if and only if its complement $\mathbf{K}^m\setminus A_i$ is $\mu^m$ measurable. But $\mathbf{K}^m\setminus A_i=\bigcup_{s=1}^\infty\bigcap_{l,l\ge s}\bigcup_{u=1}^\infty\bigcap_{k,k\ge u}\bigcup_{q=1}^\infty E_{l,k,q}$, where $E_{l,k,q}:=\{x\in\mathbf{K}^m:$ there exist $t_1,t_2\in\mathbf{K}$ such that $\max(|t_1|,|t_2|)=|\pi|^k,|t_1-t_2|=|\pi|^l,|\ {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;e_i;t_1)-\ {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;e_i;t_2)|\ge|\pi|^q$ or $|\ {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1f(x;e_i;t_1)|\ge|\pi|^{-q}\}$.

Each set $E_{l,k,q}$ is $\mu^m$ measurable, since $\mu^{m+1}(\mathbf{K}^{m+1} \setminus V_i) = 0$ and due to Lemma 10, hence $A_i$ is $\mu^m$ measurable for each $i = 1, ..., m$.

Put $T_{R,i,j}(x) := \{t \in \mathbf{K} : |t| < R, |f(x+te_i) - f(x) - t\ {}_{ap}D_i f(x)| > |t||\pi|^j\}$ and $B_{i,j,q} := A_i \cap \{x \in \mathbf{K}^m : \mu(T_{R,i,j}(x)) \le R|\pi|^j \forall 0 < R < |\pi|^q\}$, whenever $x \in \mathbf{K}^m$, $0 < R < \infty$, $i, j, q \in \mathbf{N}$. For $i > 1$ denote $Z_{R,i,j,q}(x) := \{z \in \mathbf{K}^{i-1} : |z| < R$, either $x + {}_1ze_1 + ... + {}_{i-1}ze_{i-1} \notin B_{i,j,q}$ or $|\ {}_{ap}D_i f(x + {}_1ze_1 + ... + {}_{i-1}ze_{i-1}) - {}_{ap}D_i f(x)| > R|\pi|^j\}$, also introduce the sets $C_{i,j,q,k} := B_{i,j,q} \cap \{x : \mu^{i-1}(Z_{R,i,j,q}(x)) \le R^{i-1}|\pi|^j \forall 0 < R < |\pi|^k\}$ for $k \in \mathbf{N}$ and $i > 1$, in particular, $C_{1,j,q,k} := B_{1,j,q}$ for each $k$. In view of Lemmas 10 and 13 $B_{i,j,q}$ and $C_{i,j,q,k}$ are $\mu^m$ measurable and $A_i = \bigcup_{q=1}^{\infty} B_{i,j,q}$ for each $(i, j)$, moreover, $\mu^m(B_{i,j,q} \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} C_{i,j,q,k}) = 0$ for each $(i, j, q)$, also $B_{i,j,q} \subset B_{i,j,q+1}$ and $C_{i,j,q,k} \subset C_{i,j,q,k+1}$. For a subset $S$ in $\bigcap_{i=1}^m A_i$ with $\mu^m(S) < \infty$ and every $\epsilon > 0$ there exist sequences $\{q_j : j \in \mathbf{N}\}$ and $\{k_j : j \in \mathbf{N}\}$ of natural numbers such that $\mu^m(S \setminus B_{i,j,q_j}) < \epsilon|\pi|^j$ and $\mu^m(S \cap B_{i,j,q_j} \setminus C_{i,j,q_j,k_j}) < \epsilon|\pi|^j$ for $i = 1, ..., m$ and $j \in \mathbf{N}$, consequently, $\mu^m(S \setminus G) < 2|\pi|(1 - |\pi|)^{-1} m\epsilon$, where $G := \bigcap_{i=1}^m \bigcap_{j=1}^{\infty} C_{i,j,q_j,k_j}$.

We will demonstrate that $f$ is uniformly approximately differentiable at the points of $G$. Consider $x \in G$, $j \in \mathbf{N}$ and $0 < R < \min(|\pi|^{q_j}, |\pi|^{k_j})$, $S_i := \{v \in \mathbf{K}^m : |v| \le R$ and either $i > 1$ and $(v_1, ..., v_{i-1}) \in Z_{R,i,j,q_j}(x)$ or $v_i \in T_{R,i,j}(x + v_1e_1 + ... + v_{i-1}e_{i-1})\}$, where $i = 1, ..., m$. Since $\mu^{i-1}(Z_{R,i,j,q_j}(x)) \le R^{i-1}|\pi|^j$ and since $\mu(T_{R,i,j}(x)) \le R|\pi|^j$ for $z = x + v_1e_1 + ... + v_{i-1}e_{i-1} \in B_{i,j,q_j}$, then $\mu^m(S_i) \le R^{i-1}|\pi|^j R^{m-i+1} + R|\pi|^j R^{m-1} = 2R^m|\pi|^j$. If $v \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, 0, R) \setminus S_i$, then $|f(x + v_1e_1 + ... + v_ie_i) - f(x + v_1e_1 + ... + v_{i-1}e_{i-1}) - v_i\ {}_{ap}D_i f(x)| \le \max(|v_i||\pi|^j, |v_i\ {}_{ap}D_i f(x + v_1e_1 + ... + v_{i-1}e_{i-1}) - v_i\ {}_{ap}D_i f(x)|) \le |v_i||\pi|^j$. Putting $S := \bigcup_{i=1}^m S_i$ we get $\mu^m(S)R^{-m} \le 2m|\pi|^j$ and the inclusion $v \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, 0, R) \setminus S$ implies that $|f(x+v) - f(x) - \sum_{i=1}^m v_i\ {}_{ap}D_i f(x)| \le |\pi|^j \max_{i=1}^m |v_i| = |\pi|^j|v|$.

**16. Lemma.** *Let $S \subset A \subset \mathbf{K}^m$, $f : A \to \mathbf{K}^n$, $0 < R < \infty$, $0 < C < \infty$ and $z \in S$ implies $B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R) \subset A$ with $|f(x) - f(z)| \le C|x - z|$ for each $x \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R)$. Suppose also that $y \in S$, $\mathbf{K}^m \setminus S$ has $\mu^m$ density 0 at each $z \in U_y$ for some (open) neighborhood $U_y$ of $y$ in $\mathbf{K}^m$ and $f$ is approximately differentiable at $y$. Then $f$ is differentiable at $y$ such that $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; v; t)$ is continuous on $(U_y \cap A)^{(1)}$ for some neighborhood $U_y$ of $y$ in $\mathbf{K}^m$.*

**Proof.** Suppose that $L = {}_{ap}Df(y)$, $0 < \epsilon < 1$, $0 < \delta \le R$ and put $W := S \cap \{z : |f(z) - f(y) - L(z - y)| \le \epsilon|z - y|\}$ and $\mu^m(B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, q) \setminus W) < \epsilon^m R^m$ for each $0 < q < \delta$, $q \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$. For $x \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, \delta)$ take $q = |x - y|$ and mention that $B(\mathbf{K}^m, x, q) = B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, q)$, also $W \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, x, q) \ne \emptyset$. Choose

$z \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, x, \epsilon q) \cap W$, hence $x \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, \epsilon q) \subset B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R)$, consequently,

(1) $|f(x) - f(y) - L(x-y)| \le \max(|f(z) - f(y) - L(z-y)|, |f(x) - f(z)|, |L(z-x)|) \le \max(\epsilon|z-y|, C|x-z|, \|L\||x-z|) \le \epsilon \max(|x-y|, Cq, \|L\|q) = \epsilon|x-y|\max(1, C, \|L\|)$, since $|z-y| \le \max(|z-x|, |x-y|) \le |x-y| = q$. From the arbitrariness of $0 < \epsilon < 1$ it follows, that there exists $L = Df(y)$. From Inequality (1) we have

(2) $|\bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; v; t) - Lv| \le \epsilon \max(1, C, \|L\|)$

for all $v = x - y$, $x \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, \delta)$, consequently,

(3) $\lim_{t\to 0} \bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; v; t) = Lv$ uniformly by $x \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, \delta)$,

since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary small. From the existence of $Df(y)$ it follows that $f$ is continuous at $y$. The condition $\mathbf{K}^m \setminus S$ has $\mu^m$ density 0 at each $z \in U_y$ implies that $S$ is everywhere dense in $U_y$ for some neighborhood $U_y$ of $y$. Then $|f(y + xt_1) - f(y + vt_2)| \le \max(|f(y + xt_1) - f(z)|, |f(z) - f(y + vt_2)|) \le C\max(|z - y - xt_1|, |z - y - vt_2|)$ for each $z \in S$, where $y + xt_1, y + vt_2 \in A$, $B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R) \subset A$ and $\max(|z - y - xt_1|, |z - y - vt_2|)$ can be chosen equal to $|xt_1 - vt_2|$, since $\Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$ is discrete in $(0, \infty)$ and $S$ is dense in $U_y$. Thus $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; v; t)$ is continuous on $U_y^{(1)} \cap (A^{(1)} \setminus \{(y; v; t) : \mathbf{K}^m \ni v \ne 0, \mathbf{K} \ni t \ne 0\})$. Together with (3) this gives the continuity of $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; v; t)$ on $(U_y \cap A)^{(1)}$.

**17. Theorem.** *If $f : \mathbf{K}^m \to \mathbf{K}^n$ is a locally lipschitzian function such that for each $x_0 \in \mathbf{K}^m$ there exist constants $0 < C < \infty$ and $\delta > 0$ and $0 < r \le 1$ with*

(1) $|g(x) - g(y)| \le C|x-y|^r$ *for each* $\max(|x - x_0|, |y - x_0|) < \delta$, $x, y \in \mathbf{K}^m$. *Then $f$ is differentiable at $\mu^m$ almost all points of $\mathbf{K}^m$ on a subset $G$ and $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x; v; t)$ is continuous at $\mu^{2m+1}$ almost all points of $\mathbf{K}^{2m+1}$ on a subset $V_0$ such that for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a closed subset $G_\epsilon$ in $G$ with $\mu^m(G \setminus G_\epsilon) < \epsilon$ and $Df$ is continuous on $G_\epsilon$ and $G_\epsilon^{(1)} \subset V_0$.*

**Proof.** Let the sets $A_i$ and $V_i$ be the same as in Theorem 15. For $x \in \mathbf{K}^m$ consider the map $f_x(h) := f({}_1x, ..., {}_{i-1}x, h, {}_{i+1}x, ..., {}_mx)$ for any $h \in \mathbf{K}$, so it is locally lipschitzian. In accordance with Theorem 9 $\bar{\Phi}^1 f_x(h; w; t)$ is continuous for $\mu^3$ almost every $(h; w; t) \in \mathbf{K}^3$ and $df_x(h)/dh$ is $\mu$ almost everywhere continuous by $h$ on $\mathbf{K}$ for each marked point $({}_1x, ..., {}_{i-1}x, {}_{i+1}x, ..., {}_mx) \in \mathbf{K}^{m-1}$. Since $A_i$ is $\mu^m$ measurable and $V_i$ is $\mu^{2m+1}$ measurable, then $\mu^m(\mathbf{K}^m \setminus A_i) = 0$ and $\mu^{2m+1}(\mathbf{K}^{2m+1} \setminus V_i) = 0$ and inevitably $\mu^m(\mathbf{K}^m \setminus G) = 0$ and $\mu^{2m+1}(\mathbf{K}^{2m+1} \setminus V) = 0$, where $G := \bigcap_{i=1}^m A_i$ and $V = \bigcap_{i=1}^m V_i$. Thus $f|_G$ is differentiable, $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x; v; t)|_V$ is $\mu^{2m+1}$ measurable. On the other hand, $(\mathbf{K}^{2m+1} \setminus \mathbf{K}^{2m} \times \{0\}) \subset V$, since $f$ is continuous on $\mathbf{K}^m$ and so $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x; v; t)$

is continuous on $(\mathbf{K}^{2m+1}\setminus \mathbf{K}^{2m}\times\{0\})$, consequently, $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t)$ is continuous by each triple $(\ _jx;\ _jv;t)$ and $\mu^{2m+1}$ measurable on $G^{(1)}$, $G^{(1)}\subset V$, $\mu^{2m+1}(\mathbf{K}^{2m+1}\setminus G^{(1)})=0$, since $\mu^m(\mathbf{K}^m\setminus G)=0$.

The Lusin Theorem 2.3.5 [6] asserts: if $\phi$ is a Borel regular nonnegative measure over a metric space $X$ (or a Radon measure over a locally compact Hausdorff space $X$), if $f$ is a $\phi$ measurable function with values in a separable metric space $Y$, $A$ is a $\phi$ measurable set for which $\phi(A)<\infty$, and $\epsilon>0$, then $A$ contains a closed (compact) set $C$ such that $\phi(A\setminus C)<\epsilon$ and $f|_C$ is continuous.

In view of the Lusin theorem for each $\epsilon>0$ and each $0<R<\infty$ and $\xi\in G$ there exists a compact subset $E\subset(G\cap B(\mathbf{K}^m,\xi,R))$ such that $\mu^m((G\cap B(\mathbf{K}^m,\xi,R))\setminus E)<\epsilon$ and $Df|_E$ is continuous, hence $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t)|_{E^{(1)}}$ is continuous. Therefore, the restriction of $f$ on $E$ is lipschitzian with $Lip_2(f|_E)=1$. In view of Theorem 8 there exists an extension $g_E$ on $\mathbf{K}^m$ of $f|_E$ with $Lip_1(g_E)=Lip_1(f|_E)$ and $Lip_2(g_E)=1$.

Take in Lemma 16 $S=E$ and $A=\mathbf{K}^m$. Therefore, $g_E$ is differentiable at $\mu^m$ almost all points of $\mathbf{K}^m$ and $\bar{\Phi}^1 g_E(x;v;t)$ is continuous at $\mu^{2m+1}$ almost all points of $\mathbf{K}^{2m+1}$. Since $\xi\in G$, $0<R<\infty$ and $\epsilon>0$ are arbitrary, we can take a disjoint covering $B(\mathbf{K}^m,\xi_j,R_j)$, $R_j\ge 1$, of $G$ and $E_{i,j}\subset[(G\cap B(\mathbf{K}^m,\xi_j,R_j))\setminus\bigcup_{l,l<i}E_{l,j}]$ such that $\mu^m((G\cap B(\mathbf{K}^m,\xi_j,R_j))\setminus(\bigcup_{l=1}^i E_{l,j}))<|\pi|^{i+j+k}$, where $k\in\mathbf{N}$ is some large fixed number, $i,j\in\mathbf{N}$, $E_{0,j}:=\emptyset$. Then consider $G\setminus\bigcup_{j=1}^s\bigcup_{i=1}^s E_{i,j}$ and continue this construction by induction. The family of restrictions $f|_{E_{i,j}}$ generates the function $f|_{G_1}$, where $G_1=\bigcup_{i,j=1}^\infty E_{i,j}$ and $\mu^m(G\setminus G_1)=0$. Since $E_{i,j}\subset[B(\mathbf{K}^m,\xi_j,R_j))\setminus\bigcup_{l,l<i}E_{l,j}]$, each $E_{l,j}$ is compact and each $[B(\mathbf{K}^m,\xi_j,R_j))\setminus\bigcup_{l,l<i}E_{l,j}]$ is open in $\mathbf{K}^m$ and $B(\mathbf{K}^m,\xi_j,R_j)\cap B(\mathbf{K}^m,\xi_q,R_q)=\emptyset$ for each $q\ne j$, then take $G_\epsilon:=\bigcup_{j=1}^\infty\bigcup_{i=1}^{n(j)}E_{i,j}$, where $n(j)\in\mathbf{N}$ is a sequence such that $\sum_{j=1}^\infty|\pi|^{n(j)+j+k}<\epsilon$. Each $n(j)$ is finite and $\bigcup_{i=1}^{n(j)}E_{i,j}$ is closed, hence $\bigcup_{j=1}^\infty\bigcup_{i=1}^{n(j)}E_{i,j}$ is closed in $\mathbf{K}^m$ and inevitably $Df$ is continuous on $G_\epsilon$ such that $G_\epsilon^{(1)}\subset V_0$.

**18. Lemma.** *If $A$ is a $\mu^m$-measurable subset in $\mathbf{K}^m$ and $f:A\to\mathbf{K}^n$ is locally lipschitzian, then $f$ has $\mu^{2m+1}$-everywhere in $A^{(1)}$ an approximate partial difference quotient $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t)$ and $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;e_i;t)$ for $\mu^{m+1}$ almost all points $(x;e_i;t)$ of $(A\times\{e_i\}\times\mathbf{K})\cap A^{(1)}$ and $\mu^m$-almost everywhere on $A$ an approximate differential $Df(x)$ and approximate partial differentials $D_jf(x)=\partial f(x)/\partial\ _jx$.*

**Proof.** In accordance with Theorem 8 and the proof of Theorem 9 for each $\epsilon > 0$ and $0 < R < \infty$ the function $f|_{A_{R,\epsilon}}$ has a lipschitzian extension $g : \mathbf{K}^m \to \mathbf{K}^n$ such that $g$ has the same lipschitzian constants $0 < C < \infty$ and $0 < r \le 1$, where $A_{R,\epsilon}$ is a compact subset in $A \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, 0, R)$ such that $\mu^m(A \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, 0, R) \setminus A_{R,\epsilon}) < \epsilon$. From Theorem 17 it follows that $g$ has $\bar{\Phi}^1 g$ and $Dg$ at $\mu^{2m+1}$ and $\mu^m$ almost all points of $A^{(1)}$ and $A$ respectively. Recall that one say that $B$ is a $\phi$ hull of $A$ if and only if $A \subset B \subset X$, $B$ is $\phi$ measurable and $\phi(T \cap A) = \phi(T \cap B)$ for every $\phi$ measurable subset $T$, where $\phi$ is a measure over $X$. Theorem 2.9.11 [6] states that if $A \subset X$ and $P = \{x : (V) \lim_{S \to x} \phi(S \cap A)/\phi(S) = 1\}$, $Q = \{x : (V) \lim_{S \to x} \phi(S \setminus A)/\phi(S) = 0\}$, then $P$ and $Q$ are $\phi$ measurable, $\phi(A \setminus P) = 0$, $A \cup P$ is a $\phi$ hull of $A$, $\phi(Q \setminus A) = 0$, $X \setminus (A \cap Q)$ is a $\phi$ hull of $X \setminus A$. Moreover, $\phi$ measurability of $A$ is equivalent to each of the two conditions: $\phi(P \setminus A) = 0$, $\phi(A \setminus Q) = 0$.

In view of this theorem $\mathbf{K}^{2m+1} \setminus A^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{K}^m \setminus A$ have zero densities at $\mu^{2m+1}$ and $\mu^m$ almost all points of $A^{(1)}$ and $A$ respectively. At points where both conditions hold there are ${}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1 g$ and ${}_{ap}Dg$. By Corollary 14 we have $D_i g(x) = {}_{ap}D_i g(x)$ and $\bar{\Phi}^1 g(x; e_i; t) = {}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1 g(x; e_i; t)$ for $\mu^m$ almost all $x \in A$ and $\mu^{m+1}$ almost all points $(x; e_i; t)$ of $(A \times \{e_i\} \times \mathbf{K}) \cap A^{(1)}$ correspondingly. From combinatorial Formulas $15(1, 2)$ we get, that $f$ has $\mu^{2m+1}$-everywhere in $A^{(1)}$ an approximate partial difference quotient ${}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x; v; t)$ and $\mu^m$-almost everywhere on $A$ an approximate differential ${}_{ap}Df(x)$.

**19. Theorem.** *If* $A \subset \mathbf{K}^m$, $m, n \in \mathbf{N}$, $f : A \to \mathbf{K}^n$ *and for each* $y \in A$ *there exist* $\delta = \delta(y) > 0$ *and* $0 < r = r(y) \le 1$ *such that* $ap\overline{\lim}_{x \to z}|f(x) - f(z)|/|x - z|^r < \infty$ *whenever* $z \in A$ *and* $|z - y| < \delta$, *then* $A = \bigcup_{j \in \Lambda} E_j$, *where* $card(\Lambda) \le \aleph_0$, *such that the restriction of* $f$ *to each* $E_j$ *is lipschitzian; moreover,* $f$ *is approximately differentiable such that there exist* ${}_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x; v; t)$ *and* ${}_{ap}Df(x)$ *for* $\mu^{2m+1}$ *almost all points* $(x; v; t)$ *of* $A^{(1)}$ *and* $\mu^m$ *almost all points* $x$ *of* $A$ *correspondingly.*

**Proof.** From the supposition of this theorem there follows that the density of $\mathbf{K}^m \setminus A$ is zero and $f$ is approximately continuous at each point of $A$. Therefore, $A$ is $\mu^m$ measurable and $f$ is $\mu^m|_A$ measurable in accordance with Theorems 2.9.11 and 2.9.13 [6]. Denote $Q_{R,j}(z) := B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R) \cap \{x : x \notin A$ or $|f(x) - f(z)| > |\pi|^{-j}|x - z|^r\}$ for $|\pi|^j < R < \delta(y)$ and $z \in A$ with $|y - z| < \delta = \delta(y)$ provided by the conditions of this theorem, $0 < R \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$, $j \in \mathbf{N}$. Each set $E_j := A \cap \{z : \mu^m(Q_{R,j}(z)) < R^m/2$ for $0 < R < |\pi|^j\}$ is $\mu^m$ measurable in accordance with Lemma 10 and $A = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} E_j$. If $R = |x - z| < \delta(y)$, then $\mu^m(Q_{R,j}(z) \cup Q_{R,j}(x)) < R^m = \mu^m(B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R) \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, x, R))$, since $B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R) = B(\mathbf{K}^m, x, R)$. Choosing $w \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R) \setminus (Q_{R,j}(x) \cup Q_{R,j}(z))$

we get $|f(x)-f(z)| \le \max(|f(x)-f(w)|,|f(w)-f(z)|) \le |\pi|^j \max(|x-w|^r,|w-z|^r) \le |\pi|^j|x-z|^r$. Therefore, if $x,z \in E_j$ and $|x-z| < |\pi|^j < R$, then $|f(x)-f(z)| \le |\pi|^{-j}|x-z|^r$, since $A$ is everywhere dense in $\mathbf{K}^m$. Then each $E_j$ is of diameter less than $|\pi|^j$, $j \in \mathbf{N}$. Each restriction $f|_{E_j}$ is lipschitzian and Lemma 18 gives that $f|_{E_j}$ is approximately differentiable, hence $f$ has $\mu^{2m+1}$-everywhere in $A^{(1)}$ an approximate partial difference quotient $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t)$ and $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;e_i;t)$ for $\mu^{m+1}$ almost all points $(x;e_i;t)$ of $(A \times \{e_i\} \times \mathbf{K}) \cap A^{(1)}$ and $\mu^m$-almost everywhere on $A$ an approximate differential $Df(x)$ and approximate partial differentials $D_j f(x) = \partial f(x)/\partial\, _jx$.

**20. Theorem.** *If* $A \subset W \subset \mathbf{K}^m$, $m,n \in \mathbf{N}$, $W$ *is open,* $A$ *is* $\mu^m$ *measurable,* $f: W \to \mathbf{K}^n$ *and for each* $y \in A$ *there exist* $\delta = \delta(y) > 0$ *and* $0 < r = r(y) \le 1$ *such that* $\overline{\lim}_{x \to z}|f(x)-f(z)|/|x-z|^r < \infty$ *whenever* $z \in A$ *and* $|z-y| < \delta$, *then* $f$ *is differentiable such that there exist* $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t)$ *and* $Df(x)$ *for* $\mu^{2m+1}$ *almost all points* $(x;v;t)$ *of* $W_A^{(1)} := \{(x;v;t) : x \in A, v \in \mathbf{K}^m, t \in \mathbf{K}, x+vt \in W\}$ *and* $\mu^m$ *almost all points* $x$ *of* $A$ *respectively.*

**Proof.** The field $\mathbf{K}$ is locally compact with the non archimedean multiplicative norm, hence $A$ has a countable covering by balls $B(\mathbf{K}^m, y_j, \delta_j)$ contained in $W$, where $y_j \in A$, $\delta_j := \delta(y_j)$. Therefore, $A$ is contained in the countable union of the subsets $E_j := W \cap \{z : |f(x)-f(z)| \le |\pi|^j|x-z|^r$ for $x,z \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, y_i, \delta_i)$ and $|\pi|^j \le \delta_i$ for some $i \in \mathbf{N}\}$. Suppose that there exists a sequence $\zeta_l \in E_j$ converging to $z \in \mathbf{K}^m$ as $l$ tends to the infinity. Take $x \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, |\pi|^j) \subset B(\mathbf{K}^m, y_i, \delta_i)$. There exists $l_0 \in \mathbf{N}$ such that $\{z,x\} \subset B(\mathbf{K}^m, \zeta_l, |\pi|^j) \subset W$ for each $l \ge l_0$, hence $|f(x)-f(z)| \le \max(|f(x)-f(\zeta_l)|, |f(z)-f(\zeta_l)|) \le |\pi|^j \max(|x-\zeta_j|^r, |z-\zeta_j|^r) \le |\pi|^j|x-z|^r$, consequently, $z \in E_j$. Thus each $E_j$ is closed in $\mathbf{K}^m$. Each $E_j$ is of diameter not greater, than $\delta_i$ with the corresponding $i$ and $f|_{E_j}$ is lipschitzian. In view of Theorems 2.9.11 [6] and 19 above the function $f|_{E_j}$ is approximately differentiable such that there exist $_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t)$ and $_{ap}Df(x)$ for $\mu^{2m+1}$ almost all points $(x;v;t)$ of $W_{E_j}^{(1)}$ and $\mu^m$ almost all points $x$ of $E_j$ correspondingly, since for $t \ne 0$ we have $_{ap}\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t) = [f(x+vt)-f(x)]/t$, $x+vt \in W$, $x \in E_j \subset A$. Moreover, $\mathbf{K}^m \setminus E_j$ has zero density at each $y \in A$. Then Theorem 8 and Lemma 16 provide that $f$ is differentiable such that there exist $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x;v;t)$ and $Df(x)$ for $\mu^{2m+1}$ almost all points $(x;v;t)$ of $A^{(1)}$ and $\mu^m$ almost all points $x$ of $A$ respectively.

**21. Lemma.** *If* $G \subset V \subset \mathbf{K}^m$, $h: V \to \mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\}$ *is Lispchitzian with* $r = Lip_2(h) = 1$, $\{B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, |h(y)|) : y \in G\}$ *is the disjoint family,*

$b \geq Lip_1(h)$, $0 < \alpha \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$, $0 < \beta \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$, $b\alpha < 1$ *and* $b\beta < 1$ *and* $G_x := G \cap \{y : B(\mathbf{K}^m, x, \alpha|h(x)|) \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, \beta|h(y)|) \neq \emptyset\}$ *for* $x \in V$, *then*

(1) $[(1-b\beta)/(1+b\alpha)] \leq |h(x)|/|h(y)| \leq [(1+b\beta)/(1-b\alpha)]$ *for all* $y \in G_x$ *and*

(2) $card(G_x) \leq [\max(\alpha, \beta(1+b\alpha)/(1-b\beta))]^m [(1+b\beta)/(1-b\alpha)]^m$.

**Proof.** If $y \in G_x$, then $|h(x)-h(y)| \leq b|x-y| \leq b\max(\alpha|h(x)|, \beta|h(y)|) \leq b(\alpha|h(x)|+\beta|h(y)|)$, hence $(1-b\alpha)|h(x)| \leq (1+b\beta)|h(y)|$ and $(1-b\beta)|h(y)| \leq (1+b\alpha)|h(x)|$, since $|x-z|_{\mathbf{K}^m} \geq ||x|_{\mathbf{K}^m} - |z|_{\mathbf{K}^m}|_{\mathbf{R}}$ for each $x, z \in \mathbf{K}^m$. If $y \neq g \in G$, then $B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, |h(y)|) \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, g, |h(g)|) = \emptyset$ if and only if $|y-g| > \max(|h(y)|, |h(g)|)$. Then $|x-y| \leq \max(\alpha|h(x)|, \beta|h(y)|) \leq |h(x)| \max(\alpha, \beta(1+b\alpha)/(1-b\beta))$, consequently, $B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, |h(y)|) \subset B(\mathbf{K}^m, x, \gamma|h(x)|)$, where $\gamma := \max(\alpha, \beta(1+b\alpha)/(1-b\beta))$, hence $card(G_x)[(1-b\alpha)|h(x)|/(1+b\beta)]^m \leq \sum_{y \in G_x} |h(y)|^m \leq (\beta(1+b\alpha)/(1-b\beta))^m |h(x)|^m$, since $G_x \subset G$ and $G$ is discrete, $G_x \subset B(\mathbf{K}^m, x, \gamma|h(x)|)$.

**22. Theorem.** *Suppose* $Y$ *is a normed vector space over* $\mathbf{K}$, $A$ *is a closed subset in* $\mathbf{K}^m$ *and to each* $z \in A$ *there corresponds a polynomial function* $P_z : \mathbf{K}^m \to Y$ *with degree* $deg(P_z) \leq k$. *Let also* $S \subset A$ *and* $\delta > 0$ *and* $\rho(S, \delta) := \sup_{0<|x-z|\leq\delta; x,z \in S; j=0,1,\dots,k} \|\bar{\Phi}^j P_x(z; v; t) - \bar{\Phi}^j P_z(z; v; t)\|_{C^0(V_z^{(j)}, Y)} |x-z|^{j-k}$, *where* $U_z = B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, |\pi|^\zeta)$, $\zeta \in \mathbf{N}$ *is a marked number,* $v = (v_1, ..., v_j)$, $t = (t_1, ..., t_j)$, $U^{(j)} := \{(y; v_1, ..., v_j; t_1, ..., t_j) : y \in U, y + v_1t_1 + ... + v_jt_j \in U, v_i \in \mathbf{K}^m, t_i \in \mathbf{K} \quad \forall i = 1, ..., j\}$, $V_z^{(j)} := \{(y; v_1, ..., v_j; t_1, ..., t_j) \in U_z^{(j)} : v_i \in \mathbf{K}^m, |v_i| = 1, t_i \in \mathbf{K} \quad \forall i = 1, ..., j\}$. *If* $\lim_{0<\delta\to 0} \rho(S, \delta) = 0$ *for each compact subset* $S$ *of* $\mathbf{K}^m$, *then there exists a map* $g : \mathbf{K}^m \to Y$ *of class* $C^k$ *such that* $\bar{\Phi}^j g(z; v; t) = \bar{\Phi}^j P_z(z; v; t)$ *on* $V_z^{(j)}$ *for each* $j = 0, 1, ..., k$ *and* $z \in A$.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of open subsets of $\mathbf{K}^m$. Take $b = |\pi|^{s_0}$ for a marked natural number $s_0$. Let $h_R$ be a function on $W := \bigcup_{U \in \mathcal{F}} U$ such that $h_R(x) := b\sup\{\inf(1, dist(x, \mathbf{K}^m \setminus T)) : T \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Since $\Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$ is discrete in $(0, \infty)$ and $|*|$ is the continuous norm from $\mathbf{K}$ into $\Gamma_{\mathbf{K}} \cup \{0\}$, then $h_R(x) \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{K}} \cup \{0\}$ for each $x \in W$ and $h_R(x)$ is continuous, hence for each clopen or closed $G$ in $\Gamma_{\mathbf{K}} \cup \{0\}$ its counter image $h_R^{-1}(G)$ is clopen or closed in $W$ respectively. Therefore, $W$ is the disjoint union of the closed set $h_R^{-1}(0)$ and the clopen subsets $h_R^{-1}(u)$ while $u \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$, consequently, there exists a continuous function $h : W \to \mathbf{K}$ such that $|h(x)| = h_R(x)$ for each $x \in W$, since $h_R$ is continuous.

In accordance with Theorem 2.8.4 [6] if $(X, \rho_X)$ is a metric space and $F$ is a family of its closed subsets, $\delta$ is a nonnegative bounded function on $F$ and $1 < \tau < \infty$, then $F$ has a disjointed subfamily $G$ such that for each $T \in F$

there exists $H \in G$ with $T \cap H \neq \emptyset$ and $\delta(T) \leq \tau\delta(H)$.

With each $H \in F$ it is possible to associate its $\delta, \tau$ enlargement $\hat{H} := \bigcup\{T : T \in F, T \cap H \neq \emptyset, \delta(T) \leq \tau\delta(H)\}$. Corollary 2.8.5 [6] states that $\bigcup_{T \in F} T \subset \bigcup_{H \in G} \hat{H}$.

In the considered here situation take $F := \{B(\mathbf{K}^m, x, h_R(x)) : x \in W\}$, $\delta = diam$, $\tau = |\pi|^{s_1}$ for a marked integer number $s_1 \leq 0$. Choose $G \subset W$ so that $\{B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, h_R(y)) : y \in G\}$ is disjoined, $h_R(y) > 0$, and $\bigcup_{y \in G} B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, h_R(y)) = W$, where $s_0, s_1$ are subordinated to the condition $|s_1| + 1 < s_0$. Evidently $G$ is countable. By Lemma 21 we get that $x \in W$ implies $(1 - b\beta)/(1 + b\alpha) \leq h_R(x)/h_R(y) \leq (1 + b\beta)/(1 - b\alpha)$ for all $y \in G_x$. Taking $\alpha = \beta = b|\pi|^{s_2}$ we get $[(1 - |\pi|^{2s_0+s_2})/(1 + |\pi|^{2s_0+s_2}] < |h(x)|/|h(y)| \leq [(1 + |\pi|^{2s_0+s_2})/(1 - |\pi|^{2s_0+s_2}]$ for every $y \in G_x$. Moreover, $card(G_x) \leq |\pi|^{s_0+s_2}[(1 + |\pi|^{2s_0+s_2})/(1 - |\pi|^{2s_0+s_2})]^{2m}$, where $s_0 \geq 1$, $s_2 \geq -1$ are integers.

Consider the mapping $w_y(x) := ch_{B(\mathbf{K}^m,0,1)}((x - y)/(\pi h(y))$ for $y \in G$, $x \in \mathbf{K}^m$, where $ch_P$ is the characteristic function of a subset $P$ in $\mathbf{K}^m$. Therefore, $suppw_y = B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, |\pi h(y)|)$. This function is of $C^\infty$ class with finite $C^n$ norms for each $n \in \mathbf{N}$, since each $\bar{\Phi}^j w_y(x; v; t)$ is bounded on $\mathbf{K}^m \times S(\mathbf{K}^m, 0, 1)^j \times \mathbf{K}^j$ for each $j \in \mathbf{N}$, where $S(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R) := \{x \in \mathbf{K}^m : |x - z| = R\}$ for $R \in \Gamma_{\mathbf{K}}$, $|x| = \max_{j=1}^m |{}_jx|$, $x = ({}_1x, ..., {}_mx)$. Indeed, $\bar{\Phi}^1 ch_B(x; v; t) = 0$ for $x, x + vt \in B$ or for $|x| > 1$ and $|x + vt| > 1$, $\bar{\Phi}^1 ch_B(x; v; t) = 1/t$ for $|x| \leq 1$ and $|x + vt| > 1$ or $|x| > 1$ and $|x + vt| \leq 1$, where $B = B(\mathbf{K}^m, 0, 1)$. In the latter two cases $|t| > 1$ for $|v| = 1$. Continuing by induction we get $|\bar{\Phi}^j ch_{B(\mathbf{K}^m,0,1)}(x; v; t)| \leq 1$ for each $x \in \mathbf{K}^m$, $v \in S(\mathbf{K}^m, 0, 1)^j$ and $t \in \mathbf{K}^j$, hence $|\bar{\Phi}^j w_y(x; v; t)| \leq |\pi h(y)|^{-j}$ for each $(x; v; t) \in \mathbf{K}^m \times S(\mathbf{K}^m, 0, 1)^j \times \mathbf{K}^j$.

Choose now $G_0 \subset G$ with the additional condition that
$\bigcup_{y \in G_0} B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, |\pi h(y)|) \supset W$ and
$B(\mathbf{K}^m, y, |\pi h(y)|) \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, g, |\pi h(g)|) = \emptyset$ for each $y \neq g \in G_0$
and consider the function $\phi(x) := \sum_{y \in G_0} w_y(x)$. Then $\phi \in C^\infty$ and $\phi(x)|_W = 1$ for each $x \in W$. Thus the family of functions $\{w_y(x) : y \in G_0\}$ constitute the partition of unity on $W$ associated with the family $\mathcal{F}$. They are of class $C^\infty$ and their supports form a disjoint clopen refinement $\mathcal{F}$ of covering $W$.

Consider the subset $U = \mathbf{K}^m \setminus A$ and put $\mathcal{F} = \{U\}$. Since $A$ is closed, then $U$ is open in $\mathbf{K}^m$. Applying Lemma 21 we get $h_R(x)/b = \inf\{1, dist(x, A)\}$ for $x \in U$. For $y \in S$ we take $\psi(y) \in A$ with $|y - \psi(y)| = dist(y, A)$. Then we define a function $g : \mathbf{K}^m \to Y$ by the formula $g(x) = P_x(x)$ for $x \in A$

and $g(x) = \sum_{y \in S} w_y(x) P_{\psi(x)}(x)$ for $x \in U$. Therefore, $g \in C^\infty(\mathbf{K}^m, \mathbf{K})$, since $\bar{\Phi}^j g$ are polynomials of $\bar{\Phi}^i w_y$ and $\bar{\Phi}^l P_{\psi(y)}$ with the corresponding arguments, where $1 \le i \le j$, $1 \le l \le j$ (see Corollary 2.6).

In the particular case of $X = \mathbf{K}^m$ we have

$\bar{\Phi}^j f(z; y-z, ..., y-z; 0, ..., 0) =$
$\sum_{l(1),...,l(j) \in \{1,...,m\}} \bar{\Phi}^j f(z; e_{l(1)}, ..., e_{l(j)}; 0, ..., 0)( {}_{l(1)}y - {}_{l(1)}z)...( {}_{l(j)}y - {}_{l(j)}z)$
for $f \in C^n(U, Y)$, $j \le n$, where $U$ is an open subset in $\mathbf{K}^m$, $y, z \in U$. In view of Theorem A.1 (see Appendix)

$\bar{\Phi}^j P_x(y^{(j)}) - \bar{\Phi}^j P_z(y^{(j)}) = \sum_{i=0}^k \sum_{\bar{l}_i} (\bar{\Phi}^i_y [\bar{\Phi}^j P_x(y^{(j)}) - \bar{\Phi}^j P_z(y^{(j)})](z^{(i+j)}_{\bar{l}_i})).(y-z)^i + \sum_{\bar{l}_{k-j}} R_{k-j}(\bar{\Phi}^j P_x(z^{(j)}) - \bar{\Phi}^j P_z(z^{(j)}); z^{(k)}_{\bar{l}_{k-j}}).(y-z)^{k-j}$,
where $x, z \in S$, $y \in \mathbf{K}^m$, $j \le k$, $y^{(j)} = (y; v_1, ..., v_j; t_1, ..., t_j)$, $z^{(i+j)}_{\bar{l}_i} = (z; v_1, ..., v_j, e_{l(1)}, ..., e_{l(i)}; t_1, ..., t_j, 0, ..., 0)$, $v_i \in \mathbf{K}^m$, $t_i \in \mathbf{K}$, $\bar{l}_i = (l(1), ..., l(i)) \subset \{1, ..., m\}$ for each $i = 1, ..., j$;

$(\bar{\Phi}^i_y [\bar{\Phi}^j P_x(y^{(j)})](z^{(i+j)}_{\bar{l}_i})).(y-z)^i$
$= \bar{\Phi}^{i+j} P_x(z^{(i+j)}_{\bar{l}_i})( {}_{l(1)}y - {}_{l(1)}z)...( {}_{l(i)}y - {}_{l(i)}z)$;
$R_{k-j}(\bar{\Phi}^j P_x(z^{(j)}) - \bar{\Phi}^j P_z(z^{(j)}); z^{(k)}_{\bar{l}_{k-j}})$ is the continuous residue equal to zero for $x = z$ for each $\bar{l}_{k-j}$,

$R_{k-j}(f; z^{(j)}_{\bar{l}_{k-j}}).(y-z)^{k-j} := R_{k-j}(f; z^{(j)}_{\bar{l}_{k-j}})( {}_{l(1)}y - {}_{l(1)}z)...( {}_{l(k-j)}y - {}_{l(k-j)}z)$.

Therefore,

$\|\bar{\Phi}^j P_x(y^{(j)}) - \bar{\Phi}^j P_z(y^{(j)})\| \le \max_{0 \le i \le k-j}(|y-z|^i |x-z|^{k-j-i}) \rho(S, |x-z|)$.

If $z \in A$, $G = A \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, |\pi|^{-1})$ and $x \in U \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, |\pi|)$, then we choose $y \in G$ with $|x-y| = dist(x, A)$, hence $|x-y| \le |x-z| \le |\pi|^{-1}$, $|\pi|^{s_0}|h(x)| = |x-y| \le |\pi|$ and $|y-z| \le \max(|x-y|, |x-z|) \le |x-z| < |\pi|^{-1}$. Take $s_2 \ge -1$ such that $[(1+|\pi|^{2s_0+s_2})/(1-|\pi|^{2s_0+s_2})] \le |\pi|^{-1}$, consequently, $q \in G_x$ implies $|\pi|^{-s_0}|h(q)| \le |\pi|^{-s_0}[(1+|\pi|^{2s_0+s_2})/(1-|\pi|^{2s_0+s_2})]|h(x)| \le 1$ and $|\pi|^{-s_0}|h(q)| = |q-\psi(q)|$, $|q-x| \le \max(|h(q)|, |h(x)|)|\pi|^{s_0+s_2} \le |\pi|^{s_0+s_2} \le 1$ and $|\psi(q)-z| \le \max(|\psi(q)-q|, |q-x|, |x-z|) \le \max(|\pi|^{-1}, 1, |\pi|^{-1}) = |\pi|^{-1}$ and $|\psi(q)-y| \le \max(|\psi(q)-q|, |q-x|, |x-y|) \le \max(|\pi|^{-1}, 1, |\pi|^{-1}) = |\pi|^{-1}$, since $s_0 + s_2 \ge 0$, where $\psi(q) \in G$.

If $f \in C^n(U, \mathbf{K})$ and $g \in C^n(U, Y)$, where $U$ is open in $\mathbf{K}^m$, then

$(i)$ $\bar{\Phi}^n(fg)(x^{(n)}) = \sum_{0 \le a, 0 \le b, a+b=n} \sum_{j_1 < ... < j_a; s_1 < ... < s_b; \{j_1,...,j_a\} \cup \{s_1,...,s_b\} = \{1,...,n\}} \bar{\Phi}^a f(x; v_{j_1}, ..., v_{j_a}; t_{j_1}, ..., t_{j_a}) \bar{\Phi}^b g(x + v_{j_1}t_{j_1} + ... + v_{j_a}t_{j_a}; v_{s_1}, ..., v_{s_b}; t_{s_1}, ..., t_{s_b})$ (see also Corollary 2.6).

Take $U_z = U_y = B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, |\pi|^\zeta)$, that is, $y \in B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, |\pi|^\zeta)$ with $\zeta \in \mathbf{N}$, then

$\|\bar{\Phi}^i g(x^{(i)}) - \bar{\Phi}^i P_y(x^{(i)})\|_{C^0(V_y^{(i)},\mathbf{K})} \le \sup_{q\in G_x} \max_{0\le j\le i} \|\bar{\Phi}^{i-j} w_q\| \max_{0\le l\le j}(|x-y|^i|\psi(q)-y|^{j-i})\rho(G,|\psi(q)-y|) \le |\pi|^{-i}\rho(G,|\psi(q)-y|)$, since $\bar{\Phi}^i g(x^{(i)}) - \bar{\Phi}^i P_y(x^{(i)}) = \sum_{q\in G} \bar{\Phi}^i(w_q(P_{\psi(q)} - P_y))(x^{(i)})$ and due to Formula $(i)$, also $\max_{0\le j\le i} \|\bar{\Phi}^{i-j} w_q\| \le \max_{0\le j\le i} |\pi h(q)|^{i-j} \le \max_{0\le j\le i} |\pi|^{(s_0+1)(i-j)} \le 1$. Thus,

$(ii)$ $\|\bar{\Phi}^i g(x^{(i)}) - \bar{\Phi}^i P_z(x^{(i)})\|_{C^0(V_z^{(i)},\mathbf{K})} \le$
$\max(\|\bar{\Phi}^i g(x^{(i)}) - \bar{\Phi}^i P_y(x^{(i)})\|_{C^0(V_z^{(i)},\mathbf{K})}, \|\bar{\Phi}^i P_y(x^{(i)}) - \bar{\Phi}^i P_z(x^{(i)})\|_{C^0(V_z^{(i)},\mathbf{K})} \le$
$|\pi|^{-i}\max(\rho(G,|\psi(q)-y|),\rho(G,|y-z|))$

for each $i \le k$. Therefore, by induction relative to $i$ we get $\bar{\Phi}^i g(x^{(i)}) = \bar{\Phi}^i P_x(x^{(i)})$ for each $x \in A$. From Formula $(ii)$ it follows that there exists

$\lim_{x\to z} \|\bar{\Phi}^i g(x^{(i)}) - \bar{\Phi}^i P_z(x^{(i)})\|_{C^0(V_z^{(i)},\mathbf{K})}|x-z|^{i-k} = 0$

for all $z \in A$ and $1 \le i \le k$, hence $\bar{\Phi}^i g$ is continuous at $z$ and for $i < k$ and $1 \le l \le k-i$ there are the identities $\bar{\Phi}^l(\bar{\Phi}^i g(z^{(i)}))(z^{i+l}) = \bar{\Phi}^l(\bar{\Phi}^i P_z(z^{(i)}))(z^{i+l}) = \bar{\Phi}^{i+l} P_z(z^{(i+l)}) = \bar{\Phi}^{i+l} g(z^{(i+l)})$, where $\bar{\Phi}^i g(z^{(i)})$ and $\bar{\Phi}^i P_z(z^{(i)})$ are defined on $U_z^{(i)}$ such that $z \in U_z$, $U_z$ is open in $\mathbf{K}^m$ and it is sufficient to consider $U_z = B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, |\pi|^\zeta)$.

**23. Theorem.** *If* $A \subset W \subset \mathbf{K}^m$, $f \in C^k(W,\mathbf{K}^n)$ *and*

$\overline{\lim}_{x^{(k)}\to z^{(k)}} \|\bar{\Phi}^k f(x^{(k)}) - \bar{\Phi}^k f(z^{(k)})\|_{C^0(V_{z,R}^{(k)},\mathbf{K}^n)}/|x^{(k)} - z^{(k)}|^r < \infty$

*for each* $z \in A$ *and each* $0 < R < \infty$, *where* $W$ *is open in* $\mathbf{K}^m$ *and* $0 < r \le 1$, $V_{z,R}^{(k)}$ *corresponds to* $U_{z,R} = W \cap B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R)$, *then for each* $\epsilon > 0$ *there exists a map* $g \in C^{k+1}(\mathbf{K}^m,\mathbf{K}^n)$ *such that* $\mu^m(A \setminus \{x : f(x) = g(x)\}) < \epsilon$.

**Proof.** In accordance with Theorem 20 $\mu^{m+(m+1)(k+1)}(A^{(k+1)} \setminus dom(\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}f)) = 0$ and due to Theorem 15 $\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}f$ is $\mu^{m+(m+1)(k+1)}|_{dom(\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}f)}$ measurable. From the Lousin Theorem 2.3.5 [6] it follows, that there exists a closed subset $E$ in $A^{(k+1)}$ such that $\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}f(x^{(k+1)})|_E$ is continuous and $\mu^{m+(m+1)(k+1)}(A^{(k+1)} \setminus E) < \epsilon$, where $A^{(k+1)}$ is defined analogously to $U^{(k+1)}$. Practically $\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}f(x^{(k+1)})$ is also continuous on $W^{(k)} \times \mathbf{K}^m \times \mathbf{K} \setminus \{0\}$, that is, for $t_{k+1} \ne 0$. Put

$\phi_q(z^{(k)}) := \sup_{0\le j\le k}\{\|\bar{\Phi}^j f(x^{(j)}) - \bar{\Phi}^j f(z^{(j)}) - \bar{\Phi}^1(\bar{\Phi}^j f(z^{(j)}))(z^{(j)}; x^{(j)} - z^{(j)}; 1)\|/|x^{(j)} - z^{(j)}|^r : x^{(j)} \in V_{z,|\pi|^q}^{(j)}; x^{(j)} \ne z^{(j)}\}$,

where $z^{(k)} = (z; v_1, ..., v_k; t_1, ..., t_k) \in A^{(k)}$, $z^{(j)} = (z; v_1, ..., v_j; t_1, ..., t_j)$, $q = 1, 2, ....$ Then there exists $\lim_{q\to\infty} \phi_q(z^{(k)}) = 0$ for each $z \in E$. Each function $\phi_q$ is borelian.

Theorem 2.2.2 [6] states: suppose nonnegative $\phi$ is a measure over a metric space $X$, all open subsets of $X$ are $\phi$ measurable, and $B$ is a Borel set; (1) if $\phi(B) < \infty$ and $\epsilon > 0$, then $B$ contains a closed set $C$ for which

$\phi(B\setminus C)<\epsilon$; (2) if $B$ is contained in the union of countably many open sets $V_i$ with $\phi(V_i)<\infty$, and if $\epsilon>0$, then $B$ is contained in an open set $W$ for which $\phi(W\setminus B)<\epsilon$.

While the Egoroff Theorem 2.3.7 [6] is: suppose $f_1, f_2, ...$ and $g$ are $\phi$ measurable functions with values in a separable metric space $Y$, where nonnegative $\phi$ is a measure over $X$; if $\phi(A)<\infty$, $A\subset X$, $f_n(x)\to g(x)$ for almost all $x$ in $A$, and $\epsilon>0$, then there exists a $\phi$ measurable set $B$ such that $\phi(A\setminus B)<\epsilon$ and $f_n(x)\to g(x)$, uniformly for $x\in B$, as $n\to\infty$.

In view of the Egoroff 2.3.7 and 2.2.2 Theorems [6] for each $\epsilon>0$ there exists a closed subset $F$ in $A^{(k)}$ such that $\mu^{m+(m+1)k}(A^{(k)}\setminus F)<\epsilon$ and $\lim_{q\to\infty}\sup_{z\in J}\phi_q(z)=0$ for each compact subset $J$ in $F$.

Take $G$ and $G_\epsilon$ from Theorem 17 and for $z\in G_\epsilon$ consider the Taylor expansion of Theorem A.1 with $k$ here instead of $n$ there and put $P_z(y)=f(z)+\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\bar{\Phi}^j f(z;y-z,...,y-z;0,...,0)$, hence $P_y(y)=f(y)$. On the other hand $\mu^m(A\setminus G)=0$ due to Theorems 17 and 19. Show that the suppositions of Theorem 22 are satisfied with $Y=\mathbf{K}^n$. Let $H$ be a compact subset in $G_\epsilon$ and $y,z\in H$. In accordance with Theorem A.1 we have:

$\bar{\Phi}^i P_y(y^{(i)})-\bar{\Phi}^i P_z(y^{(i)})=\bar{\Phi}^i f(y^{(i)})-\bar{\Phi}^i f(z^{(i)})-[\sum_{j=i+1}^{k+1}\bar{\Phi}^j f(z;v_1,...,v_i,y-z,...,y-z;t_1,...,t_i,0,...,0)]$
for each $i=0,...,k-1$ and $0<|y-z|<|\pi|^q$, where $y^{(i)}=(y;v_1,...,v_i;t_1,...,t_i)$ and $z^{(i)}=(z;v_1,...,v_i;t_1,...,t_i)$. Therefore,
$\sup_{0<|y-z|\le|\pi|^q;y,z\in H;0\le i\le k}|\bar{\Phi}^i P_y(y^{(i)})-\bar{\Phi}^i P_z(y^{(i)})||y-z|^{i-k-1}\le\phi_q(z^{(k)})<\infty$, where $z^{(k)}=(z;v_1,...,v_i,y-z,...,y-z;t_1,...,t_i,0,...,0)$. Since $\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}f$ is continuous on $G$, then $\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}P_y(y^{(k+1)})-\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}P_z(y^{(i)})=\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}f(y^{(k+1)})-\bar{\Phi}^{k+1}f(z^{(k+1)})$ is small for small $|y^{(k+1)}-z^{(k+1)}|$. Thus from Theorem 22 the statement of this theorem follows.

**24. Theorem.** *1. If* $A\subset\mathbf{K}^m$, $f:A\to\mathbf{K}^n$ *and* $ap\overline{\lim}_{x\to z}|f(x)-f(z)|/|x-z|^r$ *for* $\mu^m$ *almost all* $z\in A$, *where* $0<r\le 1$, *then for each* $\epsilon>0$ *there exists a map* $g\in C^1(\mathbf{K}^m,\mathbf{K}^n)$ *such that* $\mu^m(A\setminus\{x: f(x)=g(x)\})<\epsilon$.

*2. If* $A\subset W\subset\mathbf{K}^m$, $f\in C^k(W,\mathbf{K}^n)$ *and*
$ap\overline{\lim}_{x^{(k)}\to z^{(k)}}\|\bar{\Phi}^k f(x^{(k)})-\bar{\Phi}^k f(z^{(k)})\|_{C^0(V^{(k)}_{z,R},\mathbf{K}^n)}/|x^{(k)}-z^{(k)}|^r<\infty$
*for* $\mu^m$ *almost all* $z\in A$ *and each* $0<R<\infty$, *where* $W$ *is open in* $\mathbf{K}^m$ *and* $0<r\le 1$, $A$ *is* $\mu^m$ *measurable,* $V^{(k)}_{z,R}$ *corresponds to* $U_{z,R}=W\cap B(\mathbf{K}^m,z,R)$, $k\ge 1$, *then for each* $\epsilon>0$ *there exists a map* $g\in C^{k+1}(\mathbf{K}^m,\mathbf{K}^n)$ *such that* $\mu^{m+(m+1)k}(W^{(k)}_A\setminus\{x^{(k)}:\bar{\Phi}^k f(x^{(k)})=\bar{\Phi}^k g(x^{(k)})\})<\epsilon$, *where* $W^{(k)}_A:=\{(x;v_1,...,v_k;t_1,...,t_k): x\in A; v_1,...,v_k\in\mathbf{K}^m; t_1,...,t_k\in\mathbf{K}; x+v_1t_1+...+$

$v_j t_j \in W \quad \forall 1 \le j \le k\}$.

**Proof.** In accordance with Theorems 19 and 20 there exist compact subsets $H_1, H_2, ...$ such that $H_i \subset B(\mathbf{K}^{m+(m+1)k}, 0, |\pi|^{-i}) \setminus B(\mathbf{K}^{m+(m+1)k}, 0, |\pi|^{-i+1})$ for $i > 1$ and $H_1 \subset B(\mathbf{K}^{m+(m+1)k}, 0, 1/|\pi|)$ and the restrictions $\bar{\Phi}^k f|_{H_i}$ are lipschitzian, $\mu^{m+(m+1)k}(A^{(k)} \cap [(B(\mathbf{K}^{m+(m+1)k}, 0, |\pi|^{-i}) \setminus B(\mathbf{K}^{m+(m+1)k}, 0, |\pi|^{-i+1})) \setminus H_i]) < \epsilon 2^{-i}$ for $i > 1$ and $\mu^{m+(m+1)k}(W_A^{(k)} \cap [B(\mathbf{K}^{m+(m+1)k}, 0, 1/|\pi|) \setminus H_1]) < \epsilon/2$, where $W_A^{(0)} = A$, $\bar{\Phi}^0 f = f$, $k = 0$ in the first case and $k > 0$ in the second case. Using Theorem 8 by induction we construct a function $h : \mathbf{K}^{m+(m+1)k} \to \mathbf{K}^n$ such that $h|_{B(\mathbf{K}^{m+(m+1)k}, 0, |\pi|^{-i})}$ is a lipschitzian extension of $h|_{B(\mathbf{K}^{m+(m+1)k}, 0, |\pi|^{-i+1})} \cup \bar{\Phi}^k f|_{H_i}$. Therefore, $h$ is locally lipschitzian and $\mu^{m+(m+1)k}(W_A^{(k)} \setminus \{x^{(k)} : \bar{\Phi}^k f(x^{(k)}) = h(x^{(k)})\}) < \epsilon$. The applying Theorem 23 with $\mathbf{K}^m, \mathbf{K}^n, h, k$ instead of $A, W, f, k$ gives the assertion of this theorem.

**25. Theorem.** *Let $f : \mathbf{K}^m \to \mathbf{K}^n$, $m, n \in \mathbf{N}$. Let also $f \circ u \in C^{s,r}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}^n)$ for each $u \in C^\infty(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}^m)$, where $s$ is a nonnegative integer, $0 < r \le 1$, then there exists a $\mu^m$ measurable subset $G$ in $\mathbf{K}^m$ such that $f \in C^{s+1}(G, \mathbf{K}^n)$, where $\mu^m(\mathbf{K}^m \setminus G) = 0$. Moreover, for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a map $g \in C^{s+1}(\mathbf{K}^m, \mathbf{K}^n)$ such that $\mu^m(\mathbf{K}^m \setminus \{x : f(x) = g(x)\}) < \epsilon$.*

**Proof.** The non-archimedean modification of the results from [2] gives, that $f \in C^{s,r}(\mathbf{K}^m, \mathbf{K}^n)$. Then by Theorem 9 there exists $\bar{\Phi}^{s+1} f(x^{(s+1)})$ continuous for almost all points $x^{(s+1)} \in \mathbf{K}^m \times (\mathbf{K}^m)^{s+1} \times (\mathbf{K})^{s+1}$ on a set $G_{0,s+1}$ and $D^i \bar{\Phi}^j f(x^{(j)})$ is continuous for almost all points of $\mathbf{K}^m \times (\mathbf{K}^m)^j \times (\mathbf{K})^j$ on a set $G_{i,j}$ for each $0 \le i, j \le s$ with $i + j \le s + 1$. Since $G_{i,j}^{(i)} \subset G_{0,i+j}$ for each $i, j$ and $G_{0,k} = \mathbf{K}^m \times (\mathbf{K}^m)^k \times (\mathbf{K})^k$ for each $k \le s$, then $G \supset G_{0,s+1}$ and $\mu^m(\mathbf{K}^m \setminus G) = 0$.

The second statement follows from Theorem 23.

**26. Theorem.** *1. Suppose $f : \mathbf{K}^m \to \mathbf{K}^n$, $m, n \in \mathbf{N}$ and $f \circ u \in {}_{ap}C^{s+1}(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}^n)$ for each $u \in C^\infty(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}^m)$, where $s$ is a nonnegative integer, then $f \in {}_{ap}C^{s+1}(\mathbf{K}^m, \mathbf{K}^n)$.*

*2. If $A \subset \mathbf{K}$, $f \circ u \in {}_{ap}C^{s,r}(\mathbf{K}, A, \mathbf{K}^n)$ for each $u \in C^\infty(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}^m)$, where $0 < r \le 1$, $A$ is $\mu$ measurable, then for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a map $g \in C^{s+1}(\mathbf{K}^m, \mathbf{K}^n)$ such that $\mu^{m+(m+1)s}((\mathbf{K}^m_{A^m})^{(s)} \setminus \{x^{(s)} : \bar{\Phi}^s f(x^{(s)}) = \bar{\Phi}^s g(x^{(s)})\}) < \epsilon$.*

**Proof.** From the ultra-metric modification of [2] it follows, that $f \in C^s(\mathbf{K}^m, \mathbf{K}^n)$.

1. It remains to prove, that $\bar{\Phi}^s f \in {}_{ap}C^1((\mathbf{K}^m)^{(s)}, \mathbf{K}^n)$, where $(\mathbf{K}^m)^{(s)} = \mathbf{K}^m \times (\mathbf{K}^m)^s \times (\mathbf{K})^s$ and $\bar{\Phi}^s f \circ u \in {}_{ap}C^1((\mathbf{K})^{(s)}, \mathbf{K}^n)$ for each $u \in C^\infty(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}^m)$.

Therefore, it is sufficient to prove, assertion 1 for $s = 0$ up to a choice of notation. But $f \circ u \in {}_{ap}C^1(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}^n)$ for each $u \in C^\infty(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}^m)$ means in particular this for $u(t_0) = x$, $u(t_1) - u(t_0) = e_i t$ with $t_0 \ne t_1 \in \mathbf{K}$, that $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x; e_i; t)$ is $\mu^{m+1}$ almost everywhere continuous on $\mathbf{K}^m \times \mathbf{K}$ and there exists a linear mapping $T_i : \mathbf{K} \to \mathbf{K}^n$ such that $(\mu, V)ap \lim_{t\to 0} |f(x + e_i t) - f(x) - T_i t|/|t| = 0$ for each $i = 1, ..., m$, where $V = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K})$. Since $i$ is arbitrary, then $\bar{\Phi}^1 f(x; v; t)$ is $\mu^{2m+1}$ almost everywhere on $\mathbf{K}^{2m+1}$ continuous due to the combinatorial Formula:

$\bar{\Phi}^1(f \circ u)(y, v, t) = \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{S}_{j+1,vt} \bar{\Phi}^1 f(u(y), e_j, t\bar{\Phi}^1 \circ p_j u(y, v, t))(\bar{\Phi}^1 \circ p_j u(y, v, t))$,
where $S_{j,\tau} u(y) := (u_1(y), ..., u_{j-1}(y), u_j(y + \tau_{(s)}), u_{j+1}(y + \tau_{(s)}), ..., u_m(y + \tau_{(s)}))$, $u = (u_1, ..., u_m)$, $u_j \in \mathbf{K}$ for each $j = 1, ..., m$, $y \in \mathbf{K}^s$, $\tau = (\tau_1, ..., \tau_k) \in \mathbf{K}^k$, $k \ge s$, $\tau_{(s)} := (\tau_1, ..., \tau_s)$, $p_j(x) := x_j$, $x = (x_1, ..., x_m)$, $x_j \in \mathbf{K}$ for each $j = 1, ..., m$, $\hat{S}_{j+1,\tau} g(u(y), \beta) := g(S_{j+1,\tau} u(y), \beta)$, $y \in \mathbf{K}^s$, $\beta$ is some parameter. Then there exists a linear mapping $T : \mathbf{K}^m \to \mathbf{K}^n$ such that $(\mu^m, V)ap \lim_{z\to x} |f(z) - f(x) - T(z - x)|/|z - x| = 0$, where $V = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K}^m)$, since $\mu^m = \otimes_{i=1}^m \mu$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K}^m) = \otimes_{i=1}^m \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K})$ is the minimal $\sigma$ algebra generated from the family of all subsets of the form $A_1 \times ... \times A_m$ with $A_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K})$ for each $i = 1, ..., m$, consequently, $f \in {}_{ap}C^1(\mathbf{K}^m, \mathbf{K}^n)$, where $Te_i t = T_i t$ for each $t \in \mathbf{K}$ and each $e_i = (0, ..., 0, 1, 0, ..., 0) \in \mathbf{K}^m$.

2. We will prove, that $\bar{\Phi}^s f \in {}_{ap}C^{0,r}((\mathbf{K}^m)^{(s)}, A^m, \mathbf{K}^n)$, then the second statement will follow from Theorem 24.2. Thus up to the notation it is sufficient to prove the second assertion for $s = 0$. We have $f \circ u \in {}_{ap}C^{0,r}(\mathbf{K}, A, \mathbf{K}^n)$ for each $u \in C^\infty(\mathbf{K}, \mathbf{K}^m)$, particularly, for $u(t_0) = z$, $u(t_1) - u(t_0) = e_i t$ with $t_0 \ne t_1 \in \mathbf{K}$. Thus

$(\mu, V)ap\overline{\lim}_{t\to 0} \|f(z + e_i t) - f(z)\|_{C^0(W_{t_0,R}, \mathbf{K}^n)}/|t|^r < \infty$
for $\mu$ almost all $t_0 \in A$ and each $0 < R < \infty$, where $W_{t_0,R} = B(\mathbf{K}, t_0, R)$, $V = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K})$, consequently,

(1) $(\mu^m, V)ap\overline{\lim}_{x\to z} \|f(z) - f(x)\|_{C^0(U_{z,R}, \mathbf{K}^n)}/|x - z|^r \le \max_{i=1}^m ap\overline{\lim}_{\max_i |t_i|\to 0} \|f(z + e_1 t_1 + ... + e_i t_i) - f(z + e_1 t_1 + ... + e_{i-1} t_{i-1})\|_{C^0(W_{t_{0,i},R}, \mathbf{K}^n)}/|t_i|^r < \infty$
for $\mu^m$ almost all $t_0 = (t_{0,1}, ..., t_{0,m}) \in A^m$ and each $0 < R < \infty$, where $V = \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K}^m)$, since $\mu^m = \otimes_{i=1}^m \mu$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K}^m) = \otimes_{i=1}^m \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K})$ is the minimal $\sigma$ algebra generated from the family of all subsets of the form $A_1 \times ... \times A_m$ with $A_i \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{K})$ for each $i = 1, ..., m$, where $U_{z,R} = B(\mathbf{K}^m, z, R)$, $x = z + e_1 t_1 + ... + e_m t_m$, $t_i = t_{1,i} - t_{0,i}$, ${}_i z = {}_i u(t_{0,i})$, $z = ({}_1 z, ..., {}_m z)$. Thus (1) is satisfied for $\mu^m$ almost all $z \in A^m$ and the applying of Theorem 24.2 gives assertion 2.

# 3 Appendix

In [19] it was proved the non-archimedean variant of the Taylor theorem for functions of one variable and for several variables in Theorem A.5 [15].

**A.1. Theorem.** *Let* $f \in C^{n+1}(U,Y)$*, where* $n \in \mathbf{N}$*,* $X$ *and* $Y$ *be topological vector spaces over* $\mathbf{K}$ *and* $U$ *be either clopen in* $X$ *or* $X$ *be locally convex. Then for each* $x$ *and* $y \in U$ *the formula*
$f(x) = f(y) + \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \bar{\Phi}^j f(y; x-y, ..., x-y; 0, ..., 0) + R_{n+1}(f;x,y).(x-y)^{\otimes(n+1)}$
*holds, where* $R_{n+1}(f;x,y) = R_{n+1}(x,y) : U^2 \to L_{n+1}(X^{\otimes(n+1)}, Y)$ *with*
$\lim_{x\to y} R_{n+1}(x,y) = 0$*,* $L_n(X^{\otimes n}, Y)$ *denotes the space of* $n$ *polylinear continuous operators from* $X^{\otimes n}$ *into* $Y$*.*

**Proof.** If $j \le n$, then $\bar{\Phi}^j f(z; v_1, ..., v_j; 0, ..., 0)$ is the $j$ polylinear operator by vectors $v_1, ..., v_j$ as follows from application of Lemma I.2. For $n = 0$ take $R_1(x,y).(x-y) := f(x) - f(y) - \bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; x-y; 0) = \bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; x-y; 1) - \bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; x-y; 0)$. For $n = 1$ from the definition of $\bar{\Phi}^2 f$ we have $f(x) - f(y) = \bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; x-y; 1)$ and $R_2(x,y).(x-y)^{\otimes 2} := \bar{\Phi}^2 f(y; x-y, x-y; 0, 1) - \bar{\Phi}^1 f(y; x-y, x-y; 0, 0)$. Let the statement be true for $n-1$, then from $\bar{\Phi}^n(y + t_{n+1}(x-y); x-y, ..., x-y; t_1, ..., t_n) = \bar{\Phi}^n(y; x-y, ..., x-y; t_1, ..., t_n) + (\bar{\Phi}^1(\bar{\Phi}^n f(y; x-y, ..., x-y; t_1, ..., t_n))(y; x-y; t_{n+1}))t_{n+1}$ and the continuity of $\bar{\Phi}^{n+1} f$ it follows that $R_{n+1}(x,y).(x-y)^{\otimes(n+1)} = \bar{\Phi}^n f(y; x-y, ..., x-y; 0, ..., 0, 1) - \bar{\Phi}^n f(y; x-y, ..., x-y; 0, ..., 0, 0)$, hence $R_{n+1}(f;x,y) = R_{n+1}(x,y) : U^2 \to L_{n+1}(X^{\otimes(n+1)}, Y)$. Since $f \in C^{n+1}(U,Y)$, then $\lim_{x\to y} R_{n+1}(x,y) = 0$. In general the entire correction term $R_{n+1}(f;x,y).(x-y)^{\otimes(n+1)}$ need not be polylinear, because $R_{n+1}(f;x,y)$ may be nonlinear by $x-y$, but it is useful to write it in such form.

Here it is not used $D^i$, but partial difference quotients $\bar{\Phi}^i$ are used instead, then multipliers $1/i!$ does not appear and the Taylor formula is true for $char(\mathbf{K}) = p > 0$ with decomposition up to terms of order $n+1 \ge p$ as well. Considering given $x, y \in U$ we can associate with it an intersection of $\{tx + (1-t)y : t \in \mathbf{K}\}$. If $U$ is clopen, then $f$ has a $C^{n+1}$ extension on $X$, so we can consider a $\mathbf{K}$ convex clopen subset $U_1$ such that $U \subset U_1 \subset X$ instead of an initial one and denote it also by $U$. Thus, under suppositions of this theorem on $U$ and $X$ we can consider the case $\{tx + (1-t)y : t \in B(\mathbf{K}, 0, 1)\} \subset U$ for each $x, y \in U$ without loss of generality. Therefore, $R_{n+1}(y+vt, y).(tv)^{\otimes(n+1)} = t^{n+1} R_{n+1}(y+vt, y).v^{\otimes(n+1)} = (\bar{\Phi}^1(\bar{\Phi}^n f(y; vt, ..., vt; 0, ..., 0))(y; v; t))t = t^{n+1}(\bar{\Phi}^1(\bar{\Phi}^n f(y; v, ..., v; 0, ..., 0))(y; v; t))$, where $x - y = vt$. Thus, the consideration can be reduced to $x$ and $y$ along lines containing $x$ and $y$. This gives

$R_{n+1}(y+vt,y).v^{\otimes(n+1)} = (\bar{\Phi}^1(\bar{\Phi}^n f(y;v,...,v;0,...,0))(y;v;t))$,

where $\bar{\Phi}^n f(y;v_1,...,v_n;0,...,0) \in L_n(X^{\otimes n},Y)$ and

$\bar{\Phi}^1(\bar{\Phi}^n f(y;v_1,...,v_n;t_1,...,t_n))(y;v_{n+1};t_{n+1})) = \bar{\Phi}^{n+1} f(y;v_1,...,v_{n+1};t_1,...,t_{n+1})$

is continuous by $(y;v_1,...v_{n+1};t_1,....,t_n,t_{n+1}) \in U^{(n+1)}$ with

$\lim_{v_{n+1}\to 0} \bar{\Phi}^1(\bar{\Phi}^n f(y;v_1,...,v_n;0,...,0))(y;v_{n+1};t)) = 0$

for each $t$ such that $(y;v_1,...,v_{n+1};0,...,0,t) \in U^{(n+1)}$, since $\bar{\Phi}^{n+1} f(y;v_1,...,v_{n+1};0,...,0) \in L_{n+1}(X^{\otimes(n+1)},Y)$ so that $\bar{\Phi}^{n+1} f(y;v_1,...,v_n,0;0,...,0) = 0$, while $\bar{\Phi}^{n+1} f(y;v_1,...v_n,0;t_1,...,t_n,t_{n+1}) = 0$ for $t_{n+1} \ne 0$ due to the definition of $\bar{\Phi}^{n+1} f$ and $\bar{\Phi}^1 f$. This proves the desired limit property of the residue $R_{n+1}$ due to the continuity of $\bar{\Phi}^j f$ for each $j \le n+1$, since the addition of vectors and multiplication of vectors on scalars are continuous operations in $X$.

# References

[1] W. Bertram, H. Glöckner, K-H. Neeb. "Differential calculus over general base fields and rings". Expo. Math. **22** (2004), 213-282.

[2] J. Boman. "Differentiability of a function and its compositions with functions of one variable". Math. Scand. **20** (1967), 249-268.

[3] N. Bourbaki. "Éléments de Mathématique. Livre VI. Intégration. Chapitre 7. Mesure de Haar. Chapitre 8. Convolution et représentations". (Paris: Herman, 1963).

[4] B. Diarra. "Ultraproduits ultrametriques de corps values". Ann. Sci. Univ. Clermont II, Sér. Math. **22** (1984), 1-37.

[5] R. Engelking. "General topology". 2-nd ed., Sigma Series in Pure Mathematics, V. 6 (Berlin: Heldermann Verlag, 1989).

[6] H. Federer. "Geometric measure theory" (Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1969).

[7] K. Hensel. Jahresber. Deutsch. Math. Ver. **6: 1** (1899), 83-88.

[8] Y. Jang. "Non-Archimedean quantum mechanics". Tohoku Math. Publ. **10** (1998).

[9] A.Yu. Khrennikov. "Ultrametric Hilbert space representation of quantum mechanics with a finite exactness". Found. Phys. **26** (1996), 1033-1054.

[10] A.Yu. Khrennikov. "Non-Archimedean analysis: quantum paradoxes, dynamical systems and biological models". (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1997).

[11] A. Kriegl, P. Michor. "The convenient setting of global analysis". Mathem. Surveys Monograph 53. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1977.

[12] S.V. Ludkovsky. "Irreducible unitary representations of non-Archimedean groups of diffeomorphisms". Southeast Asian Mathem. Bull. **22: 3** (1998), 301-319.

[13] S.V. Ludkovsky. "Measures on groups of diffeomorphisms of non-Archimedean manifolds, representations of groups and their applications". Theoret. i Math. Phys. **119: 3** (1999), 381-396.

[14] S.V. Ludkovsky. "Quasi-invaraint measures on non-Archimedean groups and semigroups of loops and paths, their representations. I". Ann. Math. Blaise Pascal **7: 2** (2000), 19-53.

[15] S.V. Ludkovsky. "Quasi-invariant and pseudo-differentiable measures on non-Archimedean Banach spaces with values in non-Archimedean fields". J. Math. Sci. **122: 1** (2004), 2949-2983 (previous variant: Los Alamos Nat. Lab. preprint **math.GM/0106170**).

[16] A. Ostrowski. "Untersuchungen zur arithmetischen Theorie der Körper". Math. Zeit. **39** (1935), 269-404.

[17] "$p$-Adic Mathematical Physics." 2nd International Conference (Belgrad, 2005). Editors: A.Yu. Khrennikov, Z. Rakić, I.V. Volovich. AIP Conference Proceedings **826**, New York, 2006.

[18] A.C.M. van Rooij. "Non-Archimedean functional analysis" (New York: Marcel Dekker Inc., 1978).

[19] W.H. Schikhof. "Ultrametric calculus" (Cambridge: Cambr. Univ. Press, 1984).

[20] W.H. Schikhof. "Non-Archimedean calculus". Nijmegen: Math. Inst., Cath. Univ., Report **7812**, 130 pages, 1978.

[21] V.S. Vladimirov, I.V. Volovich, E.I. Zelenov. "$p$-adic analysis and mathematical physics" (Moscow: Nauka, 1994).

[22] A. Weil. "Basic number theory" (Berlin: Springer, 1973).